Class 209.2R Book M366
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

CATHOLIC THOUGHT & THINKERS SERIES
Edited by W. B. O'Dowd & C. C. Martindale, S.J., M.A.

Introductory

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ASP-784

CATHOLIC THOUGHT
AND THINKERS

Introductory

By

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., M.A.

CATHOLIC SUMMARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

1920
HARDING & MORE, LTD
The Ambrosden Press
119, High Holborn, London, W.C.1

NIHIL OBSTAT: H. DAVIS, S.J., CENSOR DEPUTATUS.
IMPRIMATUR: EDM. CAN. SURMONT, VIC. GEN.
WESTMONASTERII, DIE 23 SEPTEMBRIS 1920.

209.2R
M366
72429

The Publishers to the Reader

IT is constantly said, if not that the Church stifles thought, at least that she has not contributed to the advancement of thought, especially since the Renaissance. Even those who are ready to admit that Catholics think, and have done service to thought at any rate when the Church was paramount in Europe, do not generally know what her intellectual contribution has been.

It is proposed therefore to form a series of handbooks entitled CATHOLIC THOUGHT AND THINKERS which shall serve to put before readers material to enable them to form, or revise, their judgement in this department. It is not to be a series of saints' lives, though many Catholic thinkers have of course been saints, but will include men like Roger Bacon and Bossuet; nor will the series confine itself to those only who are at all points satisfactory; it may contain books on men like Tertullian, Tauler, and Lamennais. Nor again will it contain primarily psychological studies of these men nor historical sketches of their times. Enough will be said to help a reader to understand the kind of man *he is reading about, and also the* kind of thought *possible to his age, its roots in his past, and its effects on his future. Indeed, should the series prosper, it may fall naturally into groups*

representing various periods, each of which may be prefaced by a more purely historical survey of that phase of civilization of which the thinkers dealt with formed an organic part.

But on the whole it is desired that the personages here studied should be allowed to speak for themselves, with the necessary minimum of preface, comment, and appreciation. The French series, LA PENSÉE CHRÉTIENNE (*Bloud et Cie, Paris*), *may herein serve as model or rather inspiration. We do not intend to copy it, still less to translate it, but we acknowledge a debt of inspiration to it.*

It may prove possible for writers to group round a central figure those lesser authors who preceded or developed his master-work, thus avoiding the impression that their subject was an isolated phenomenon, a lonely "jewel set in deathly night." Catholic thought has been massive and social: it is a glow of varied brightness, not a series of explosions of light in a black sky.

The books will be on an average between 150 *and* 200 *pages each. Written for the general reader, and for members of study-clubs, they will be useful, it is hoped, to university students and seminarists. The various authors will of course be free to express their own appreciations of their subjects, but these will be personal and not editorial. The essence of each book will be the doctrine of the man it deals with. The general editorship of the series has been entrusted to the Rev. W. B. O'Dowd and the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., M.A. The artistic embellishments of the volumes will be by Mr. Paul Woodroffe.*

HARDING & MORE, LTD.

Contents

EDITORS' PREFACE . . pp. 13–14

CHAPTER I

FROM THE DIFFUSION OF THE FAITH TO THE DEATH OF ORIGEN (254)

(i) The Church in Palestine: influence of Greek philosophy upon Judaism in Alexandria: Syncretist tendencies and the Gnostic systems. (ii) Christianity and philosophy: the earliest Apologists and their method. St. Justin. (iii) The early heresies: Marcionism; Montanism; Monarchianism. Neoplatonism. The great Christian protagonists; St. Irenaeus; Clement of Alexandria; Tertullian; St. Cyprian of Carthage; Origen . . . pp. 15–39

CHAPTER II

FROM ORIGEN (254) TO THE DEATH OF AUGUSTINE (430)

(i) The causes of misunderstandings between East and West. The great heresies and the Greek Fathers: Arianism, St. Athanasius: St. Gregory the wonder-worker, and the Cappadocian triad, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory of Nazianzos. St. John Chrysostom; St. Cyril of Jerusalem. Nestorianism,

St. Cyril of Alexandria. (ii) The Latin Fathers ; St. Hilary of Poitiers ; St. Jerome, St. Ambrose. (iii) St. Augustine. The centre of gravity shifts to the West, and the Church now talks Latin.
pp. 40–60

CHAPTER III

FROM THE SACK OF ROME (476) TO THE DECLINE OF THE MIDDLE AGE (1303)

(i) The Formation of Christendom, 476–1073. Principles of cohesion which survived the break-up of the Empire. The "handers-on" of the old culture : Boethius, Cassiodorus, St. Gregory the Great ; St. Isidore. The Benedictines. The Irish monks ; St. Columba ; St. Columbanus. The course of civilization in England. St. Augustine ; St. Benet Biscop ; St. Aldhelm ; St. Bede the Venerable. King Alfred. The revelation of national temperament. St. Boniface ; St. Willibrord ; St. Ansgar. The Court of Charlemagne. Alcuin of York ; Raban Maurus ; Walafrid Strabo ; John Eriugena ; Paschasius Radbert. Culture in Italy ; Monte Cassino ; St. Peter Damian ; St. Anselm of Bec. Gerbert of Aquitaine. The rise of nations. (ii) The Triumph of Christendom, 1073–1303. The XIIIth Century Renaissance. The rise of Universities. The problem of Faith *v.* Reason. Abaelard and

Bernard. The Books of "Sentences"; Peter Lombard. The problem of "Universals." The Victorines. The re-birth of Aristotle. The Franciscans and Dominicans. Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, and St. Thomas Aquinas. Scholasticism. St. Bonaventure. The decline of Scholasticism. Duns Scotus, and the tendency to divorce the truth of Philosophy from that of Faith. The anarchic character of medieval heresies. The Catharists, the Albigenses; Wyckliff; the Lollards and the Hussites . . . . . pp. 61–92

CHAPTER IV

REVOLUTION AND REFORMATION (1303–1789)

(i) Humanism. The Latin "renaissance" in Italy. Petrarch. The rise of Nationalism as against Christendom. The Greek renaissance in Italy and the Papal attitude towards it. The New Learning in Germany and England. Erasmus; Thomas More. (ii) The Religious Revolution. Luther; Calvin. (iii) The Catholic Reformation. The Council of Trent: revival of studies; scriptural, Maldonatus; historical, Baronius; dogmatic, Bellarmine; then Suarez. Results of the Church being on the defensive. Mysticism; St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross. Education; St. Angela Merici; Ignatius of Loyola and the Jesuits.

(iv) The XVIIth Century. The centre of activity shifts to France. Philanthropy ; St. Vincent de Paul. Piety ; St. Francis de Sales. The reaction ; du Bay, Jansen, Pascal, Quesnel ; The Quietists, Descartes. Renewal of positive study ; Petau, the Benedictines of St. Maur ; Papebroche, etc. Philosophy ; Descartes ; and *Philosophisme*. The need of a Revolution to conquer Absolutism . . pp. 93–110

CHAPTER V

THE MODERN ERA

(i) The mental chaos of the modern period. The Rationalist tendency. The rejection of Papal authority involved sooner or later that of all authority save the individual intellect. English deism : Lord Herbert of Cherbury : Hobbes, Locke, Hume. French scepticism ; Bayle, Diderot, d'Alembert. The *Encyclopédie*. Voltaire, d'Holbach, Rousseau. The German rationalist movement. The Court of Frederick II of Prussia. The Aufklärung. Its alliance with Poetry and the Pulpit. Lessing, Goethe, Schiller. Romanticism. "Faust."—The Pietist movement. The Reform within the Reform. Holland and Switzerland : Spener and Zinzendorf's Herrnhuters. In England, the Quakers and John Wesley. Swedenborg.—The advance and independence of "Science."—The "false dawn" of Socialism. Rousseau.

The practical effects of the European revolutions. Proudhon, Saint-Simon; R. Owen; Lassalle and Karl Marx. The Catholic reaction: Lammenais, Lacordaire, Ozanam; Ketteler, Mermillod, Comte de Mun, Cardinal Manning, Leo XIII. The theology of Authority and the Papacy. J. de Maistre, de Bonald. The Vatican Council. (ii) The Mental Revolution. Kant, Schelling, Hegel; Positivism and Comte. Interaction of these evolutionary systems with Darwinism. (iii) Positive research and "criticism." In Scripture, Strauss, Baur, Renan; in the history of dogma, Weizsäcker, Harnack. The comparative history of religions and the philosophy of religion; Tylor, Spencer, Frazer; Reinach, etc. The German reaction; Schleiermacher, Ritschl; and the Romeward movement; Görres, Schlegel. Echoes within Catholicism; Hermes, Günther, Froschammer. Döllinger and the "Liberal" movement. The pessimist reaction; Schopenhauer, Nietzsche.

The romantic school in France; Chateaubriand; efforts for reconciliation with the new thought; Lamennais, de Bonald, Bautain; Gioberti, Gratry, Rosmini. The conflict between the ideals of *L'Univer* and *Le Correspondant*, and its counterpart in England; W. G. Ward; Acton. The Vatican Council; Modernism.

The evolution of France since 1870. Materialism; Taine, Renan. The decline from Gambetta to Combes. The reaction in

literature, science, philosophy, and national life ; Bourget ; Huysmans, Coppée ; Psichari ; Barrès ; Bergson, Delbos. Influence of W. James's pragmatism.

(iv) The evolution of Christian thought in England. The Evangelical movement ; the Liberal movement, Whately, T. Arnold ; Hampden, Colenso. The influence of Shelley, Keats, Byron, Wordsworth ; Erskine and Campbell ; F. D. Maurice. Thinkers from Stanley and Jowett to J. and E. Caird and T. H. Green. The Oxford Movement ; Keble, Pusey, J. H. Newman. Effect upon the Established Church. Conclusion. Catholic rejuvenescence . . . pp. 111–160

Editors' Preface

THE scope of this series can be very accurately defined.

It is not meant to be a history of the Christian Church, nor even of Christian theology. Nor is it intended to set out the influence exercised in the world by the Catholic Church in every department alike, social, for example, artistic, or even moral. But Christian men have thought about their Faith in itself; and about the world they live in, because of their Faith, and in relation to it. These volumes, therefore, aim at giving the reader pictures of eminent Catholic thinkers,[1] and a sufficient statement of what they thought, and of the substantial contribution which they thus made to the history of ideas in the world, and to Christian civilization in particular.

The writers have aimed at allowing their subjects, as far as possible, to speak for themselves: only a necessary minimum of comment or criticism has been supplied. On the other hand, it has been wished that not bloodless schemes of thought, merely,

[1] This is not meant to preclude this series from containing, if desirable, studies of men who, like Origen or John Eriugena, may not have been fully orthodox, or who, like Lamennais, have ended in rupture, even, from Catholic obedience.

nor abstract theories, should be made available to our readers; nor again, detached "lives" of men and isolated personalities. Therefore a preliminary and a concluding volume have been planned, in which, respectively, are set out the massive historical movement within which these men were born, developed, and exerted their influence; and, the continuous currents of thought which they necessarily created, deflected, accelerated or checked. It should be added that the respective authors have freely formed and expressed their own estimates of their subject-matter, and that the series as such is not responsible for these. Nor has it been intended that the method of treatment and its application should be absolutely homogeneous in all the volumes alike.

Thus these volumes are not meant, then, at all as propaganda or apologetic. They hope to supply an organic survey of Catholic thought and a "live genealogy" of Catholic thinkers; so that from a comprehensive view and continuous vital contact, each reader may draw such general conclusions as he is able; or enrich, substantiate, or correct, what he already possesses.

THE EDITORS

Catholic Thought and Thinkers: Introductory

Chapter I

FROM THE DIFFUSION OF THE FAITH TO ORIGEN (*d.* 254)

HRISTIANITY claims that it exists for the supernatural sanctification and salvation of humanity, and issues only by way of consequence into a philosophy or a social order, or the development of the arts and sciences, or a political system.

None the less, by the laws of its own being, it came at once into contact with the general life of the civilized world, in the departments of social organization and of thought especially.

Of the former and its influence there we do not, in this series, propose to speak, save incidentally. From the outset, however, we can begin to trace action and reac-

tion, due to the new added element of a Christian thinking people, in the intellectual domain.

§ i

Christianity and Judaism; Alexandrianism; Gnosticism.

Christianity did not at first reveal itself as an intellectual system; nor indeed, in Palestine, would it have won acceptance had it done so. Despite the diffusion—perhaps quite general—of the Greek language there, and the presence of certain Hellenized groups, such as, to some degree, the Sadducees, the Jewish mind in Palestine remained thoroughly Semitic, and did not trouble itself with abstract thought of any kind. Metaphysics were not the contribution which Palestine was to make to the world's history. Pious and educated Jews were on the whole occupied with the interpretation and application of the Law, and the religious history and above all the destiny of the chosen race. Casuistry, not even the deeper problems of Ethics (despite the Book of Job, and certain passages in Apocalyptic books, con-

cerned with the origin and transmission of sin, and the like), absorbed contemporary moral theologians. Hebrew religious historians themselves had worked as much by vision, interpretation and proclamation as by scientific research. Therefore in the Palestine terrain we shall not look for, nor should we find, the development of Christian thought. Indeed, it is clear from the outset that the *points of contact* between the Jewish and Christian faiths could be few save such as concerned the Law and its obligation, and Prophecy and its fulfilment. With regard to the former, the subject had been, practically, exhausted by St. Paul; in the eyes of the orthodox Jew, Christianity even at its most conservative had broken with Moses; and the Apostle James, Bishop of Jerusalem, is said to have been killed by order of the High Priest previous to the siege of that city. As for prophecy, as long as the Christians felt it necessary to argue with the Palestinian tradition, "fulfilments" of this or that verse of the Old Testament writings were laboriously sought, not, one must confess, with any great success, in so far as the convincing of contemporary Judaism was hoped for.

And on the whole such pages of the earlier Christian controversialists have ceased to be of any great interest in detail: what stands massively forth in them is the belief that the Law is not annulled, precisely, by the Christian revelation, but included in and transcended by it; and that Christ is the "desired" alike of the heathen and the Jew. The doctrine of Fulfilment, not Destruction, is the permanent part of such discussion as was provoked by the clash of Christian and Jewish representatives.

It was very different where Jewish belief had been subjected to an alien culture. This had happened in Alexandria, where Greek thought and the Stoic philosophy had profoundly affected it. Sometimes the influence had been slight and not unhealthy: orthodox consequences are to be found in the Sapiential books, Alexandrian in quality, where Greek elements may be diagnosed, enriching and not corrupting the ancient tradition (for it would be out of place to dwell in any way upon a possible Persian influence upon the writers of post-exilic literature). On the whole, however, the determination of cultured Alexandrian Jews to sacrifice nothing either of their own

tradition, or of the Greek contribution, and to find all Plato in Moses, led to disastrous and fantastic confusion, and especially to a riot of allegorizing, which was the only way of explaining how Jewish history really signified what philosophy was teaching. Indeed, the Stoic philosophers were, more or less in Plato's train, accustomed to clothing their theories in any myth, of whatever origin, though preferably Egyptian, which suited their purposes. The era of fusions, "syncretism," reduction of all cults, systems and mythologies to certain fundamental notions, conceived as held in common by the religious soul of mankind, had by now assuredly begun. Not alone, then, did the Alexandrian Jews, in this manner, seek and profess to find an inner meaning in their Scriptures which should put them in harmony with what was best, to their seeing, in that Greek philosophy which represented for them all culture, but many kinds of Oriental faiths were on the look-out for much the same thing, namely the discovery of a spiritual unity underlying apparent differences.

This "seething pot" of religious speculation was yet further perturbed when

the doctrines of Christianity were tossed into it. Astonishing amalgams were created (not indeed with any goodwill on the part of Christianity, because its leaders and its folk held themselves passionately aloof, for the most part, from any such "communion") between pagan and pagan-judaic systems and certain Christian doctrines, practices, or traditions. For there was much in Christianity to which the representatives of such cults and systems could not but attend and which, indeed, they found serviceable. For at the root of all their speculations lay the problem: How bring God, who is Spirit, into touch with the World, which is Matter? How, in regard of God, was the World made? How is it governed? What must be the ladder by which the soul of man shall reach the divine? A thousand answers were given; but they came always to include an assertion of a hierarchy of beings, each more debased than its predecessor, interposed between the Inviolable Spirit, God, and low material existences. Into this hierarchy, names like Jehovah, Adam, Christ, were inserted. Not only was all existence interpreted in function of its place in this hierarchy of the

more or less spiritual, but an ascetical method was formed by which man's soul might gradually ascend from a baser to a loftier plane. Thus matter came to be willingly regarded as bad in itself, and here especially the Syro-Judaeo-Hellenic systems gradually joined hands with Persia, and thereby with India. Those who thus understood the hidden meaning and method of the world and of life, were regarded as an inner circle, an *élite*, endowed with special knowledge; and these various schemes, especially when, under Trajan and Hadrian, their protagonists began to come regularly to Rome, could be grouped conveniently under the general name of *Gnosticism*. Against such men as these, who professed to know more and better about Christian dogma than the Christians did themselves, battle was bound, sooner or later, to be waged. Anticipating, we may say that the great name here to be recalled, is Irenaeus; and anticipating yet further, we shall say that this sort of claim to a special inner knowledge, and to a method mechanically certain of success in transcending the low and material and achieving spiritual summits, will prove to be a re-

current element in Christian history, and to meet with a no less regular resistance from all who held the traditional and orthodox doctrine. Meanwhile it provoked *thought*, and the effect on life, as it was construed according to, or in defiance of, such a doctrine, has been again and again profound.

§ ii

Christianity and Philosophy

However, it was not Gnosticism which first compelled the Christians seriously to *think out* their position. Gnosticism confronted them like some drifting, ever-changing mist, or even fog, through which a few outlines of firm things might indeed display themselves, though distorted and disguised, but on to which as a rule only the gigantic, fantastic shadows, cast by an unbridled imagination, were reflected, under the violently coloured illumination of human passion. There was in it little enough of strong philosophy, there were few enough of the solid facts of history, for well-regulated minds to cope with. It was different when the new Church found

itself confronted by the true civilization of the Empire, in which Roman Law and Greek philosophy had achieved some sort of legitimate communion. Especially the Romanized Stoicism of this period stood like an edifice fairly firm, austere of outline, yet ornate in decoration, and not uncoloured by emotion, like the imperial Roman architecture. Just as in the political organization of the Empire the Christian conscience found often enough a foe, but always an unmistakeable strongly-featured fact to which it could well see how to address itself, so, despite the shortcomings and confusions of contemporary thought, there was enough there which was articulate for Christian thinkers to come to grips with.

Not that they were, to start with, eager to do so. It was not clear that Revelation had anything to do with Philosophy, nor whether it need ever be asked of a believer that he compete with the wisdom of this world. St. Paul, at Athens, had seemed to fail. The great physician Galen could call the Christians "honest fools": Celsus will say that their leaders exhort them not to enquire, but only to believe. "Thy

faith shall save thee," was their only answer, he affirmed.

But stress of Imperial persecution drove the Christians to defend themselves, and to show they were not the anarchists that the Government believed they were, nor the hateful, incestuous, murderous and cannibal fanatics that popular imagination pictured. Besides, men of education, more or less well equipped with the prevalent culture, began to join them, ex-philosophers who were unable *not* to think. Thus came into existence the first Apologists, who undertook the defence of the new and persecuted faith.

Fragments of early "apologies" survive, like those of Aristides or Quadratus, addressed to Emperors who doubtless never read them. JUSTIN, here, is the first name of note. These men honestly tried to find points of agreement between themselves and the purer pagan thought, and to recommend their creed by showing that it contained whatever of best the old philosophy had prized, and that the special beliefs of Christians operated in harmony with this.

Thus, there were sufficient elements in

current philosophies, asserting the existence of a God, one, spiritual, transcendent and yet immanent, to enable the Christian writers to start from this point. They proclaimed it loudly as their central dogma. They proceeded thence to the nature of the soul, and the consequent character of worship, which must itself be spiritual and pure. Here they were able, indeed, to make a good point against popular pagan worship, though on the whole they limited themselves to defending their own cult. The precipice of atheism, and the morass of superstition (as Plutarch put it) were alike alien to the Christian "way."

They found moreover a sympathetic theme in the prevalent doctrines of the *Logos*. The Thought of God, which was made manifest as the Plan of the Universe, and was fragmentarily expressed in and by the mind of every man, and ever more completely as men grew towards harmony with the divine Mind itself, was a notion variously elaborated, yet underlying many if not most of the philosophies of that time, and especially the later forms of Stoicism. Here was a fact of double value. For not only it served the Apologists (somewhat in

the train of the Fourth Gospel) to link current speculation with the Person of Jesus Christ ; but also it enabled them to look with kindliness on those pagan systems to which they might have been expected to feel hostile.

Herein, however, they did too much and too little. On the one hand, they were tempted to grant almost too much to the heroes of philosophy: not alone they detected "Christians before Christ," but the Word which indwelt, say, a Socrates, appears insufficiently distinguished from That which was personally united with the human nature of Jesus. But this may be quite clearly recognised—when you read these Apologists as a whole—as due to the inadequate development of theological language, even more than to the desire to see as much good as possible in antiquity, and not at all to any radical confusion of thought or instability of dogma.

On the other side, there was a real timidity with regard to the human career of Jesus Christ. Some writers succeed in defending Christianity without even mentioning His name. This again is due to an intelligible determination to begin from

what could be agreed about, and not from what would shock and offend. In preaching or worship, such a method would have been felt, clearly, as disloyalty : to the early Christians, their personal religion simply *was* Christ. In arguing, however, the reticence appeared tolerable and even wise. Adoring gratitude, moreover, forbade the risking of too contemptuous an assault on the beloved Name. Here, too, however, the dogma reveals itself as quite firm intrinsically and uncompromised. The historicity of Christ, unique son of God, is never slighted. Perhaps it is most vigorously proclaimed by the Apologists' insistence on the fulfilment of all prophecy in His Person.

Flowing directly from this is the value assigned to His Redemptive rôle. The sense of *sin* is strong in these early Christians, and they appeal, better than did philosophy, to the conscience of ordinary men. The sick, dislocated world is to be healed by being conformed, gradually, to Him who, as expression of the Father's perfect thought, is the sole explanation of its past, and sole hope of its future. And fortunately, the Apologists could

make a strong practical appeal to the general level of Christian behaviour. Christian morals stood out in such bold contrast, at this happy time, to pagan behaviour, that they became themselves an argument.

Hence, then, it may be said that quite the earliest thought was unafraid to play upon the whole available mass of theory and experience ; to indicate lines of interpretation some day destined to be magnificently worked out when an adequate language for this should have been created ; a Catholic and authoritative dogma is relentlessly proclaimed ; Catholic worship is, with unexpected accuracy, outlined ; Catholic be haviour can be shown asnot clashing with the theory. These men, having to initiate systematic thought upon these specifically Christian topics, not only provide us with invaluable documents relating to contemporary belief and practice, but stand at the head of that long line of master-thinkers who will create a new language, order and define new thoughts, distribute accurately the emphasis of their appreciation of the old, and establish perfectly the relation of that ancient pre-Christian

world, and of *natural life* generally, to the new Revelation.

§ iii

The Earliest Protagonists

Nor was development long in coming. Very soon great names emerge. The intellectual activity of those to whom the tradition was entrusted was stimulated almost at once by new systems, invented by men who quite honestly—we may presume—believed that they were themselves explaining or even improving the Christianity of the crowd. Almost every species of *religious interpretation* displays itself at once. From the outset (and partly under the influences which created the Gnostic-Christian sects) the problem of how the Divine, in Jesus Christ, was united to the human, had distressed men's understanding. Already in St. John's Epistles you can see how men were for saying that Christ was not *truly* God, or else, not *truly* man. Either His manhood was phantasmal, or His Sonship one of adoption merely. Again, a Marcio of Sinope, at Rome about 140, feels that Catholicism already needs a reform, and,

by his intellectualist simplification of the Faith, founds a school which ends in a vague moral individualism. He rejects, like some Luther before his time, such parts of the Scriptures as do not suit him—practically all, in fact, save the non-Jewish parts of Paul—and introduces a spirit of criticism which enables his disciple Apelles to preach, in substance, that a man needs but to live well, to hope in the Crucified, and to keep his own ideas. Even more "subjectivist" is Montanus, c. 150, an ex-priest of the frantic Asiatic worship of Cybele. In him the "Spirit," he declares, operates directly and needs no other sanction; a "gale of prophecy," altogether individualist, sweeps across the Church; Christ is about to return; New Jerusalem to be founded. No authority, whether based on reason or history, is to withstand Montanus and his "inspiration." The "Monarchians" were intellectualist again. The Catholic Church, strong in her belief that she has right and duty to "try the spirits," had authoritatively encountered a Montanus; now she will rebuke those who substitute "Euclid and Aristotle" for the Scriptures, and found themselves upon syllogisms and the self-

sufficiency of logic. "If Christ be true God" (they ask), "how then is God unique? Either, He is God's "son" by courtesy, by adoption only; or, in Him the Father died . . ."

Such were typical hostile influences within the Christian area. In the person of Celsus (c. 180) paganism made its first comprehensive, intellectual attack on Christianity. Not until Origen's *Against Celsus* was a systematic answer made. Therein the best of the old was pitted against the best of the new, and a period ends. Of Origen's place we say a word below: here, for the sake of completeness, we add a paragraph upon the final effort of paganism, even more comprehensive than Celsus's rationalism, which is best known as Neoplatonism; an effort meant no less for the salvation of the old, than for the defeat of the new and rival religion; for that a *religion*, and not mere philosophy was needed, were the competitor to prove adequate to the task, was at last realized. Strung on far firmer thought than were the Gnostic systems, it was yet allied to them on its ascetical side; and, preaching the duty of transcending sense by intellect,

and intellect itself by direct intuition of the divine, it led its votaries to ecstasy, and achieved a religious language of passionate sublimity. It was a mystical theology in action ; and, despite its aberrations, moral and speculative, as wild as anything for which the Gnostics were responsible, a Porphyry (c. 270) could, in his *Against the Christians*, concentrate on and not unworthily attack an Origen. This system had its echo within Christian consciences themselves ; Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch in 260, had, by 268, so volatilized all dogma in the spirit of Neoplatonism, that his own Church condemned him and notified the condemnation to the Pope.

Such must stand for an account, inadequate enough, of the atmosphere which the first thinkers and spokesmen of Christianity were breathing. Add to this, perhaps, that it was saturated, for a pagan, by the belief in Rome. Eternal Rome, the rock-rooted Empire, was a practical dogma even for the Stoic who could be spiritually cosmocentric, and contemplate the vision of a Universal City.

The name of IRENAEUS has already been

mentioned. Bishop of Lyons about 180, there were Asiatic, Palestinian, Greek, Roman and Western elements in his composition; he knew the world thoroughly and also the Church; and could at once proclaim what was essential, traditional, and inviolable, and also, true to his name, go far in the direction of reconciling differences based on misunderstanding. His refutation of the Gnostics contains the first systematic exposition of the Catholic economy, and of the Incarnation and its implications in particular. The mass of material he supplies, stands clearly, despite its still clumsy outlines, as a foundation for almost all that followed. Soaked in the tradition set by Paul and John, none can, for all that, insist more firmly than he does, upon the absolute value of contemporary Church-Authority. It is scarcely to be regretted that in him are to be found a thousand literary and academic flaws, proper to his age, so coherent yet comprehensive is his outlook when once it is properly disengaged from its inevitable complications.

CLEMENT of Alexandria, who wrote about 200, is to be considered in connection

with Justin, on whom he depends but whom he outstrips. He too seeks to see and recognize good everywhere ; not alone in Philosophy, which, like the Law, led men to Christ's school, but even (and this is apparently new) in the pagan religious worship, especially the initiatory mysteries. Not that he fails to condemn all that in them undoubtedly merited condemnation ; but he willingly adopted—and adapted—their terminology, and accepted their triple process of purification, initiation, revelation as something to which Christian ideal was not indifferent. What good he sees, he unifies, purifies, totalizes, and transcends. Such is his bold yet firmly Catholic attitude. "Alexandrian" tendencies, even in what we have said of him, are undoubtedly to be discerned ; and, when we say that his greatest work was, perhaps, to make possible an Origen, we allude not only to the merits of that astounding genius and his orthodox achievements, but also to his aberrations. It remains that in the men we have spoken of is to be seen not alone that resolute loyalty to the Christian faith which we might have expected, and which is called, when it rejects what is alien to

it, intolerance, but a wide outlook, a rich experience, a great generosity.

These early protagonists of Christian thought are in no sense bigots. They use the old, enrich it, and produce it, thereby modelling the future. This is why their thought does not remain shut up within itself, but has proved powerful for the shaping of human history.

Naturally, at this period, the first Christian thinker who expressed himself in Latin, was an African. TERTULLIAN (c. 200) followed hard upon Apuleius; and though their styles are by no means identical, each is almost terribly alive with that spirit which in Africa—since Spain had done with sending authors to the Empire—was preserving and transforming the Latin language. Tertullian at all events was the first original genius of the Church. Educated in full military tradition, a brilliant jurist, and converted in Rome in the prime of life, he deliberately envisaged Christianity in the way proper to a Roman and to himself—as a Warfare and a Law. In this way he developed a whole new aspect of the Faith; and though his violent and fevered soul at last

revolted, and defied the law and broke his more than military oath to Catholic discipline, and joined the rigorous, individualist sect of Montanus, his influence was lasting: after him Gnosticism was finished with, and currents were set moving in which other minds too moved.

In fact, the second of the great Africans, CYPRIAN of Carthage, converted in middle age about 246, was his disciple. This wealthy patrician, cultured and open-minded and smooth of style, is less original than his master, but offers Tertullian's ideas, polished and liberalized, to a public whom that writer's extraordinary Latin would of itself have sufficed, probably, to repel. Less of a rebel, he yet was over-stern; disallowed heretic baptism and joined issue, herein, with the Pope; both died martyrs' deaths within a year of each other, and Cyprian never said anything which should have caused a final rupture. The discussion helped much to elucidate Catholic dogma, and to him too later ages are indebted.

But it was not with these two men that the first period of Christian thought was to close. ORIGEN (c. 185–254) towers like an Alp above hillocks when you compare him

with his predecessors. His was a Hebrew, Greek, Egyptian, and Oriental culture; his outlook was upon all the science of his time; his experience was wide and varied, and he was flattered by the Imperial family itself. Imperial too and creative was his intellect; he seeks to be constructive; in the wake of his predecessor, the Alexandrian Clement, this Alexandrian in his turn tries to synthetize all antiquity with Christianity and to lose the treasures of neither. It was he who answered Celsus, and against Origen, as against their transcendent foe, the Neoplatonists pitted themselves. He was the founder of a scholarly study of the Old Testament; and of both Testaments he sought to make a reliable exegesis. His book of *Fundamentals* included, indeed, a study of the nature of Faith and Authority, and an adaptation of Stoic ethic and of what in reality was the last of Neoplatonist mysticism. He perceived, it is true, an esoteric Christianity, but refused on the whole to dissociate its truth from that of the exoteric faith, from the creed of the ordinary man, that is, the great Catholic tradition. His fault, indeed, was a thoroughly Alexandrian one, a certain tendency to over-spiritualize;

and he had certain outlying theories not ultimately approved by Catholic theologians; but such was his tremendous personality that for a long while thinkers had to be pro- or anti-Origen, and in the heated controversies thus set going, he was doubtless much misinterpreted, though even his adversaries owed to him more than they might guess. With him, therefore, a first period closes.

Such then, briefly suggested, is the line along which travelled the earliest Christian thought, and such are the personalities of the first great Christian thinkers. It was asked of them that they should see what they could do with the material which antiquity presented to them, or even flung against them. Self-defence, and then spontaneous attack, were what stimulated them. And next, within the Christian area itself, fiery spirit, freezing intellect, melting emotionalism tested the character of tradition and needed to be dealt with. Given the times and their mentality and their assets, was there ever a more comprehensive, yet concentrated attack made upon Christian belief than this, in the days of its earliest self-consciousness? At least we can say this,

no part of it did Christian thinkers shirk. All that could be said, done, or felt against and about them, was displayed. All of it alike, the courageous Christian mind confronted. Although the hour of serene construction and development had not yet struck, originality and theologizing for its own sake were never lacking. The value of that defence, and the quality and influence of this endeavour, the separate volumes on each of these great men, which follow, must study and on it may decide.

Chapter II

FROM ORIGEN (d. 254) TO AUGUSTINE (d. 430)

FOR three hundred years the handful of men who, as the earliest Christian Church, had been flung desperately forth upon and indeed against the colossal Roman Empire, deemed Eternal, against what was, for a true citizen, Omnipotent State and more than Infallible Church, struggled, in the person of their descendants, to conquer it; and in 313 Constantine practically declared Christianity to be the religion of the Empire. In 330 he removed to Byzantium, recreated as Constantinople, and left Rome to the Popes. This meant that the Christian way of thought had already permeated the masses; and although it did not itself, here and there, remain inviolate from the contact, and certainly did not annul national temperaments nor inherited *ways of thinking*, yet it was Christianity which by now was setting the problems which were recog-

nized as the proper things to think about. The Greek and Oriental worlds were rationalist and mystical respectively, though sometimes both at once; they were alike always restless; the one was often over-chill, the other usually over-fevered, and both always thoroughly contemptuous of the slow-witted Western, practical almost to the exclusion of intellectual nimbleness; they flung themselves therefore into speculations which created schools of thought within Christianity, and elaborated systems which were not always in organic union with traditional and guaranteed belief—"heresies," that is; though despite this, they always seemed to know themselves reduced to appeal for sanction and authoritative decision to the Roman See.

Unfortunate as these discussions might have been at any given moment in themselves, though destined doubtless to issue into an ultimate clarification of thought, they were often made quite disastrous owing to the temper of the disputants. For this was far from pure. To start with, the immemorial reciprocal dislikes between East and West, as we said, survived. To the Roman, the Greek constantly appeared

as an effeminate, intriguing logic-chopper: to the Greek and the Hellenized Oriental, the Western seemed a vulgar boor. All culture was perceived by them as surrounding the Emperor in "New Rome": Italy was clearly a dying land in possession of degenerates. Besides, the Latin often possessed no words for ideas the Greek used freely; and even such words as existed, in the West, and seemed transposed directly from the Greek, or meant to express what certain Greek words stood for, did so, often enough, ambiguously and indeed quite misleadingly.[1]

Hence there were three sources of discord. There was the general intellectual contempt felt by East for West, which caused the dogmatic decisions of Rome, though regularly appealed for, to be resented; there was the sheer difficulty of terminology; there was the political jealousy between Constantinople and Rome, and indeed between the three great cities Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria, and especially

[1] An example is *hypostasis*, and its Latin form *substantia*; these stood, in the discussions on the Trinity, for perfectly different things. Both, in a sense, mean *substance*; but the Greeks' use of their word enabled them to say there were three hypostases in the Trinity, which to the Latin appeared to imply three substances, an unmistakeable heresy.

between the first and third, never really extinguished till Alexandria fell to the Mohammedans. When therefore the Emperor, either from his personal theological predilections, or because heresy had grown so powerful that for the sake of the political unity of the Empire it had to be flattered, leaned towards heterodoxy or was definitely heretical, not only his court but the bishops and even the patriarchs who depended more nearly on him, found the whole weight of the world thrown against their spiritual stability, and the dazzle of the throne gravely confused their faith.

§ i

The Greek Fathers

The keen thought of this Eastern world quite early concentrated on two problems: The God we worship is One; how then is He Three? The Christ we worship is God, and is also Man; how then, if He be truly the one, is He truly too the other?

After the earlier efforts to solve the second of these problems, at any rate, a Paul of Samosata (d. 269; cf. page 32)

had taught that the One God, incapable of appearing in substance upon earth, had merely "filled" the man Jesus with His "Word" or "Power." Lucian of Antioch, his disciple (d. 311), held Christ to be one Person, indeed, but that in Him the Logos, which played the part of soul, was a secondary, created Essence. Thus Christ would be neither *true* man, nor *true* God. Arius was, in his turn, a disciple of Lucian. He developed his theory in Alexandria.

To sum it up quite briefly:

God, One, Uncreated, Eternal, Universal Source of Existence, "invisible" even to His Son, incapable of acting directly upon matter, "begot," therefore, that Son to be the instrument of creation. The Son, the "produced" Wisdom of God, is to be named "Wisdom" only by His *share* in the Wisdom Un-produced. By grace He is God, not by nature. Produced was He from nothingness: "There *was*, when He was not." He had His beginning; God had none. In (or with) Time, therefore, He was begotten, when and as God willed, and could be begotten again, though not better. Fore-

known as destined to persevere, and therefore "glorified" from the outset, in *Himself* He could deteriorate. Infinitely unlike, therefore, were these Persons of the Trinity (and unlike, too, the Third, though this was not the kernel of the controversy) each from each. Herein his school disregarded and indeed defied Tradition. His disciples sneered at Authority and Antiquity, and relied on Logic.

Opposed to this was the Catholic Church, represented now by one giant of power, ATHANASIUS. Deacon to Alexander of Alexandria, when in 321 he excommunicated Arius, and already forceful in controversy as well as of lofty moral habit and a friend of monks, he was chief spokesman for the Catholics at Nicea, 323. He succeeded Alexander as Patriarch in 328, the year in which Constantine's Arian sister, Constantia, persuaded the Emperor into new favour towards the heretics. Henceforward he had no peace. When theological and personal attacks proved useless, he was denounced as "no friend to Caesar." He had "stopped the corn-supplies from Egypt." From 335–338 he was exiled to

Treveri (Trèves) on the Moselle. Arian hopes ran high. The Emperor ordered the solemn restoration of Arius at Constantinople. In 336 the city was *en fête*. At the climax of the festivity Arius died hideously and suddenly. The next year, Constantine, baptized on his death-bed by his half-Arian kinsman, Eusebius of Nicomedia, died too. In 338 Athanasius returned. But the Government was more Arian than ever. Athanasius appealed against the rival Arian bishop to Rome, and in 340 was banished, and took refuge there at Pope Julius I's command. In 345 he returned in new triumph to Alexandria. Savage quarrels continued. In 356, murderously attacked in church by imperial troops, he fled, this time to the monks in the Libyan desert. Trickery mated with force, till "the whole world groaned and wondered to see itself Arian." Recalled in 362, Athanasius was again, but more briefly, exiled, once more among the monks, and from 365 to 366 he fled to his father's tomb by the Nile. But new heresies were ousting Arianism, and, from his return, at his flock's indignant outcry, in 366, he lived in peace, incomparably

the most famous man of his time, till his death in 373.

I have thus encroached, as it were, upon material and details more properly to be looked for in the volume consecrated to Athanasius, in order to show the sort of setting in which the protagonists of Christian thought were to be found.

The vicissitudes of Athanasius were, indeed, extreme. But among his predecessors and followers alike there was little enough of calm, even when personalities were suaver. Thus GREGORY of Pontus, the "WONDER-WORKER" (c. 213–270), a disciple of Origen, and concerned in the condemnation of Paul of Samosata (264–265), combined a beautiful gentleness with his converting zeal, and as it were anticipated the Nicene theology of the Trinity.

He stands at the back of three other Asiatics of high fame. BASIL (330–399) and his brother GREGORY afterwards Bishop of NYSSA were sons of a Cappadocian family, long distinguished by wealth, property, office and religion; they received, and were ever grateful for, a superb education in the universities of Caesarea, Constantinople and even Athens. Here they met once more

their old Caesarean friend, GREGORY of NAZIANZOS, and also Julian, the Emperor's nephew, afterwards known as "the Apostate," destined to bring the inevitable dislocations into the lives of these representative Christians, Basil especially. Basil, a man of enormous philanthropic and reforming energies (not least liturgical), kept to the end his Cappadocian bluff humour and common-sense, refined by his home and a Greek education into true grace and charm, and found himself in touch alike with the chief men of the West, such as Pope Damasus and St. Ambrose, and with Syrians, like St. Ephrem. He died in 379, perhaps the most attractive character of his times, and eclipsing somewhat his less cultured brother, who, none too pious as a lad, and having married and taken up oratory for profession, was consecrated Bishop in 371 only, and died about 395, a very voluminous, though secondary author. Gregory of Nazianzos, timid by temperament, had a life of the most tempestuous description, and from 380 was regarded by the poor minority of the Constantinople orthodox as their Bishop. He died in 389 or 390. The theology of these men is singularly

sane and sober; and, despite its debt to Alexandria, is not rarely a check upon her tendency to the fantastic. Cappadocian practicality, combined with a true Greek scientific spirit, and, in Basil, with a sensitive appreciation of beauty, makes them an attractive group.

The superb and dramatic figure of St. John Chrysostom (c. 344–407) arrests the attention of anyone studying this period; but he is confessedly less an original thinker than an unparalleled rhetorician; he too was persecuted by that Imperial power which his denunciations never spared. His most lasting work has been, however, to re-popularize St. Paul, so much so, indeed, that Pauline theology and in great measure the Pauline spirit seemed incarnate in himself, and have never been forgotten or forgettable since his day.

Meanwhile St. Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315–386) was assisting the development of dogma by his twenty-three Catechetical Instructions (345–350), in which the completeness of Sacramental doctrine in his day is valuably set forth.

But the true successor of Athanasius was Cyril of Alexandria (c. 380–444), a much

calumniated but certainly somewhat terrifying personality. Patriarch of Alexandria in 412, his first years there were spent in violent conflict with such pagan worship and philosophy as survived under the patronage of the Governor Orestes. But his historical controversy was with the Nestorians. Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople in 428, speculated on *how*, in Jesus Christ, the divine Nature was allied to the human. Arianism and its successor Apollinarism had had their death-blow. In Christ were acknowledged *true* God and *true* man. Catholic Faith taught that these two Natures coexisted in Him so that he was yet *one person*. Nestorians asserted that the tie which bound them was merely moral. Some, even, would have this union to have begun only at the Baptism. In Christ, therefore, were two persons; one adorable, the Word; the other, mere man, *used* by the former who but indwelt him. Of this man, Mary was mother, and could not therefore be termed Mother of God. Cyril protested. Appeal was made by both sides to Pope Celestine; Cyril was approved. The quarrel ended in the Council of Ephesus, 431, with Cyril for Papal delegate.

At the council the historical doctrine, that in Ch ist were two natures and one person, was proclaimed. As at Nicea the dogma of the Son's *consubstantiality* with the Father created the word *Homo-ousios* ("of identical substance"), as opposed to *Homoi-ousios* ("of like substance"), so here the dispute crystallized in Mary's ancient title *Theotokos*, "Mother of God." He to whom she gave birth *was God*. The city went mad with joy. To shouts of *Theotokos*, torchlight processions escorted the bishops home, and an era closed.

Briefly to sum up this period.

The fatuity of the jest that it was all a quarrel about an *i* (Homo-ousios *v.* Homoi-ousios) is now at once apparent. In the realm of thought, we see here intellects as strong and subtle as any had been or were to be, exercised on problems as transcendent as any that had occupied a Plato or an Aristotle. We watch a new disciplining of the mind which degenerate philosophies had abandoned, and which ensured for Europe the possibility and duty of *clear thinking*. Without these men, future generations would have been helpless to profit by, or to cope with, the Arabs (whose

influence on brains, thus prepared, was anyhow enormous); the whole Greek heritage would probably have been lost to us. Moreover, by this colossal effort to express *accurately* what was thought *exactly*, language, no less than thought, has been refined and enriched. Problems of Personality and Reality, even in the sphere of natural philosophy, were stated with a perfection Aristotle had not reached. The freedom of the will itself was elucidated and defined. In natural theology, we owe to the Arian controversy the maintenance and precision of the invaluable notion of *analogy*, whereby we gauge at once the value and the essential insufficiency of our ideas of God. The world was re-taught, and better taught, that the creature's knowledge of the Creator can be *true*, even though of necessity it is inexhaustive and in its very mode inadequate.

In the realm of revealed religion, again, these discussions assisted in a singularly valuable way the notion of developement of doctrine and of ideas, that is, the gradual unfolding, by the God-guided intellect, of the original "deposit," and of the rôle therein of tradition and authority. Gregory of

Nazianzos woke many echoes when he lucidly set forth the progressive character, through Old to New Testament, and thereafter in the Church, of the revelation, and its expression in theology, of the doctrine of the Trinity. As for the doctrines themselves, history now makes it patent that the substance of the dogmas, as set forth by these "Doctors," and not by the heretics, was what preceding generations had indeed held, massively and essentially. Without these great men, humanly speaking, the very nature of the Catholic dogmas of *God* and of *Christ* would have been ruined at the base; and European history would have been totally different, inasmuch as it has been, in fact, constructed entirely around the Catholic faith in the Incarnation.

We cannot here dwell upon the fact that what these great men taught was in harmony alike with the *lex credendi*, as imposed by the supreme authority at Rome, and with the *lex orandi*, that is, the spirit and instinct of the Christian folk. Nor was it for nothing that the humblest, no less than the highest, were forced by this whole movement to keep before themselves

the highest possible of notions, that is, the whole realm of the strictly supernatural. For, as these Fathers, Cyril of Alexandria especially, saw and preached, were Jesus Christ not in the perfect sense true God and true man, the whole scheme of supernatural salvation—man's deification, they with terrible boldness call it—collapsed. I cannot express with what dazzling splendour the mystic doctrine of Paul, John and Irenaeus is elaborated by St. Cyril. Our Incorporation with Christ, the Indwelling of the Spirit, our substantial "Immortality," "Incorruption," depend on the affirmation that in the one Person of our Saviour are conjoined God and Man.

§ ii

The Latin Fathers

Such was the spirit of Greek Catholicism, freely fastening on what was good in the pagan past, masterfully accepting, subduing and assimilating it. The West, according to her special genius, was producing great men to carry across the Eastern contribution. Yet abstract thought was not really the business of the Roman. Doubtless a

HILARY of Poitiers (c. 300–367), who had been much in contact with Greeks, did most, perhaps, and with great honesty and good sense and real originality, to find Latin equivalents for their terminology which should exactly convey its meaning. Yet if an AMBROSE of Milan (338–397) used Alexandrian allegory and actual Greek originals (*e.g.* Basil's sermons), it was more for the drawing of moral lessons than from intellectualist sympathies. He is an adequate example of the Latin love, and power, of religious law and order. His preferred habit of mind is best seen in his *De Officiis*, a treatise on Christian "duty" after the model of a Stoicized Cicero; but apart from his immense administrative successes, we most of all, perhaps, ought to be grateful to him for his share in the formation of Augustine.

With Ambrose stands ST. JEROME (c. 340–420). This Dalmatian, admirably educated in letters, law and philosophy, and even an antiquary (he excavated the Catacombs under Pope Liberius), "baptized" his literary and critical zeal, and from 373 to 379 lived as a hermit in Syria, learned Hebrew, and devoted himself to a

scientific study of the Scriptures. Finally he perfected his Greek, and was equipped for the work which has made him a figure not only dramatic more than any, it may be, save Chrysostom, in this earlier period, but a force in European history. His translation of the Scriptures became the Vulgate, and its influence on language proved incalculable. He stands at the head of Latin scholarship and criticism.

§ iii

St. Augustine

But these first centuries sum themselves up in AUGUSTINE. As a power in Christian history, he had no predecessor during the period we have spoken of, and no comparable successor, not even in Aquinas. His *Confessions* have ranked almost with the *Psalms*, and transcend the *Imitation*. His universal genius recapitulates the past, and directs the future ; and there is nothing in human psychology which does not recognize itself in him.

Born in 354 at Tagaste in Numidia, he was educated at Carthage ; and the passions of his youth were disciplined, after a time,

by his ambition only. From literature he turned to philosophy, and became a "hearer" of that strange Eastern "Church," Manichaeism, with its doctrine of ultimate dualism, the substantiality of Evil, and the duty of a ruthless asceticism to free the soul-spark, the divine element of Light, imprisoned in the dark matter of the body. Disillusioned here too, he went to Rome in 383, and at Milan met St. Ambrose. He passed through universal scepticism into that "New Platonism" which was to colour all his thought, and thus all theology until and indeed after Aquinas. Convinced at first that he would discover nothing among the Platonists which should prove repugnant to Christianity, he was to separate, however, from Plato in his doctrine of God, and from the New Platonists in that of the Universe. His third great crisis was moral, and with the minimum of shock to his intellectual system, he became a Christian in 387. By 396 he was Bishop of Hippo in Africa.

It is impossible to do more than indicate some of the heads, as it were, of his gigantic theological labours.

Manichaeism, with its idolatry of *reason*,

forced him to think out, and he was the first adequately to formulate, the relation in which Reason stands to Authority and to Mystery, and Faith to Thought and Will. Donatism, a revolt in Africa which was at least as much anti-imperialist as heretical, made him develope his doctrine of the Church, the priesthood, sacraments and holiness. In him, "Roman Catholicism" is so apparent, that when this was realized, he came to be called its "founder," until historical research drove its origin back to the beginning of the Christian movement. No one before him disengaged so exactly the notions constitutive of the "sacraments"; to that of "penance," in particular, he gave a basis of coherent theory; to him is due the clear distinction between precept and counsel, and mortal sin and venial. Perhaps the power of his brain is best seen in his handling of the doctrine of the Trinity; for, dealing with the same mystery as the Greeks did, he applied a method of his own, and grasped the problem, as it were, by a different handle, losing nothing of what they had achieved, and avoiding many of their special difficulties. His personal history,

and his controversy with the Pelagians, caused him to elaborate the whole subject of Grace, the Supernatural Life, and Predestination, and has coloured thereby Catholic thought and practice ever since. Sometimes tainted, the current of his theology has affected every century since his day. Even pure Augustinianism must not be taken as historically and dogmatically exhaustive of the Church's mind. It was distinctly a reaction occasioned by his own sense of sin and the Pelagian glorification of "nature." The Greeks, on their side, accustomed to Gnostic depreciation of matter, were optimists, free, and emphasized the *good* in man and history. The two tendencies must be co-ordinated, and perhaps that achievement is still for the future to make perfect. *The City* or *State of God* was Augustine's last and almost greatest work. Appalled by the sack of Rome in 410, the world was asking whether, after all, the rejection by Christianity of the old gods had not worked that ruin. Augustine, in this first real Theory of Empire, set God's Eternal City over against the passing pageant of the world, and showed how, though the old age was indeed gone by,

the "Middle Age," as he was the first to call it, and of which his book marked the beginning, should itself pass on, without real break of union, into the consummation of the whole created Process. He died in 430, just before the Vandals took Hippo.

"Augustine, then, shifts the centre of Christian gravity from East to West, and henceforth the Church talked Latin. He rescued the riches of the Old and Newer Greece, and Romanized the double treasure. He translated speculation into life and thereby set the current of genuine Catholic mysticism; he infused Christian activity with thought, and thus inspired a true scholasticism. Indeed, it is the power of his own *life*, where to know was to love, and where search for truth was passionate, which alone explains his unequalled influx into the Life of Christianity."

Chapter III

THE MIDDLE AGE (476–1303)

N the break-up of the Western Empire, and the sack of Rome in 476, and the cessation of any united secular Government—for the Eastern exarch at Ravenna, the "Duke of Rome," and what not, stood for nothing save new centres of disunion—it might well have been thought that civilization itself was at an end. In Italy itself worse was to come. For the Ostrogoths under Odoacer and especially Theodoric displayed true intelligence, and a real desire to unite themselves organically to what they found, and socially and even legally to create a new order. But they were followed by the Lombards, trampling upon institutions and the past generally, striving to superimpose a system wholly alien to the distracted country: and the invaders, with their capital at Pavia; the great nobles, unextinguished, but dwindling, often enough, into a kind of

established brigand-chiefs; and the Pope, unquestionably by now the first and almost the only man in Italy, seemed destined never to amalgamate.

§ i

The Formation of Christendom (476–800)

What, in this ruin of all the educational machinery of the Empire and dissipation of its atmosphere, this sack of libraries and schools, this rout of literature and philosophy, was Europe, struggling towards birth, to find for its developing? Politically and socially, no less than religiously, the centre of unity was the Pope. Departmentally, so too were the Bishops; and it was their sees which, together with the great monasteries, made homes for the intellectual life. On the whole, the invaders did not like the towns; but in each considerable town a Bishop had his throne (for Diocletian's political mapping-out of the Empire survived in the "episcopal geography" of the Church), and a whole system of monasteries soon linked together the remaining portions of each province. The rough and uneducated are often singularly impressed

by a culture they do not share; and the barbarians looked with considerable awe at these fearless men and established communities, and it was in and through them that thought lived and learning was diffused, and by their means that the treasures of the old world suffered no irrevocable ruin.

The ruin, however, was considerable. A frightful poverty settled down upon the countries; a terrible disheartenment laid hold on those who could appreciate and make use of opportunities for study and thought; when all was so unstable, it scarcely seemed worth while to originate; and already the old world appeared to have withdrawn itself to an enormous distance, and to persist not vitally but in parchments and records. Therefore little could be asked of these men save that they should loyally and laboriously transmit to a problematical future what could be rescued from the past. A BOETHIUS (d. 525), son-in-law to Symmachus, a pagan philosopher still under his robe of Christian thought, handed pathetically forward, in his voluminous works, much that no one wanted any more; much too of the simpler *data* of thought

and science with which the crippled generations to come might cope. His is still one of the greater names. In CASSIODORUS (c. 490–585), with his long family traditions of office held for Rome, and himself an official of the Goths (540), and a monk, and with little ambition save to carry forward what other men had said, we enter on an age of guides, handbooks, excerpts, epitomes and compilations. These two are however, albeit in different measure, in vital sympathy with the perished past. They reach forward, but their feet stand well within the old frontiers. ST. GREGORY (c. 540–604), most justly called *The Great*, man of affairs, monk, papal legate in the East, then Pope, strikes all his vital roots into a world of Augustinian Christianity. Miracles are his delight; surrounded by chaotic, anarchic barbarism (as he felt it), judgement, punishment, and hell are almost his profoundest preoccupation. He is soaked in Scripture which he allegorizes freely, but always (Roman-, not Alexandrian-wise) for practical ends. With his gigantic capacity for wise, strong government, and his naive, unliterary, yet most effective handling of traditional theology,

he was not alone exactly the man his amazing century required, but supplied to the Middle Age much of the material on which it was to work. With these must stand ST. ISIDORE, Bishop of Seville (c. 560–636), he too a compiler and a hander-on, whose massive, unoriginating work preserves—from allegory to grammar—what he felt himself and his age willing and able to assimilate.

Rome, then, destined to Latinize, as far as need be, the barbarians, held in herself forces sprung from Greece, Egypt and the Nearer and Further East. The barbarians contributed new temperamental qualities, and from this intermingling of vital currents Europe was to spring.

Meanwhile the great Benedictine Order had spread ubiquitously; every one of its monasteries, you may say, was a hearth where the fire of thought burned bright, or at least smouldered, and that was much, for there was no question of extinction. And other monastic systems, too, not of Benedict's creation, yet increasingly governed by his spirit, guarded the flame. Perhaps without exaggeration we may assign its diffusion not least to the monks of Ireland.

Even in her saints, Ireland was now uniting the love of roving to the ascetic spirit; up to the Hebrides and the Shetlands her missionary monks wandered, to be harried by, but also fusing with, the Norsemen. Two great names stand out, Columcille (St. Columba, 529–597), from Donegal, a royal clan-abbot and a very terrible hero, who, after much founding of monasteries —some 30 in Ireland, and 30 more among the Picts and Scots—died at last in peace at Iona. More widely civilizing was the work of COLUMBANUS, a monk of Bangor, who crossed to Gaul about 590. Clovis's grandson, Guntran, granted him Luxovium (Luxeuil) for monastery; and after a passionate life of controversy, he received at last, from the Lombard Agilulf, Bobbio near Genoa, where he died (615), having created what was to prove an almost unequalled centre for the diffusion of Christian learning. St. Gall, in Switzerland, founded by another Irish emigrant, became from the mid-eighth century another centre of European culture and education.

In England, Christianity had from the outset been Roman, but by force of Teuton

invasion, and in particular from the landing of Hengist and Horsa in 449, it had been thrust back into the mountains. When Pope Gregory I resolved to convert the Anglo-Saxon, Augustine brought into Kent, with Christianity, a whole civilization, and when the older Bishops strove to resist him, being disaccustomed by now to Rome and the Latin world, they were as a matter of fact resisting the great European society, in process of formation, and striving to commit a national suicide. However, a Theodore at Canterbury (602–690), a Benet Biscop at Wearmouth and Yarrow, and the Irish monasteries in the south-west and the north, set a double current of learning which united in Aldhelm of Malmesbury (675). Greater than he was BEDE of Yarrow (673–735), whose charm is as permanently sweet as his sense is sane. He is a kindlier Isidore, voluminous, and not originating, save by the gentle force of a great personality. Bede educated monks, who nurtured kings. King Alfred, in his turn (849–901) diffused knowledge among the less learned by his translations, added to by his own lofty, melancholy, yet alert reflections. The *sentiment* already

discernible in the Teutons, now, in this English King, meets and softens without corrupting the harder elements in the Latin culture, and the permanent qualities of the English spirit begin to reveal themselves.

It would be impossible to enter into any detail as to the carrying abroad, with religion, of culture into Frisia by the Saxon yet thoroughly Roman Willibrord; or deep into "Germany" by Boniface, who, as papal legate, crowned in 752 that Pepin who was Charlemagne's father: or into Denmark by St. Ansgar. It is enough that we have indicated the source and direction of the spiritualizing currents as they move across the troubled seas of that unlucid "interspace 'twixt world and world."

With the triumph of Charlemagne, a new focus for thought was provided. For this violent and undisciplined conqueror had yet an intuition that without the work of intellect his position was inadequately glorified and established. His court became a centre of true culture, reappropriating the past, assimilating and transmitting its treasures. It is true that there was not

here much that *originated*. Yet strong intellects were not rare. ALCUIN of York lived at court from 781 to 796, and then till 804 re-created the abbey schools of St. Martin at Tours. This genial and none too academic scholar makes even the dry bones of orthography and logic live. He survived in his even more learned disciple RABAN MAURUS, of Fulda, Tours and Mainz (776–856), a voluminous commentator, he too, of the Scriptures, an industrious compiler of earlier men's lore, but with high views of the function of *right reasoning*, foreshadowing a still distant scholasticism; a strong opinion of the value of profane antiquity, and a keen and spirited though not uncommon appreciation of Astronomy. From him the lamp was taken by his pupil Walafrid Strabo, of value for his simplifications of his master's obscurities. We will confess that the learning of this period all made, in intention, towards religion, and led into the area of theology. Characteristically, perhaps, the minds of this still Latinized generation preoccupied themselves with the old problem of predestination. Raban Maurus fiercely combated the Saxon Gottschalk, an oblate

at his monastery of Fulda and a Calvin before his time in his ill-balanced exposition of the harsher elements in Augustinianism. Moreover, these protagonists witness to, and provoke, a wider interest. Councils are formed to look into these subtlest of moral questions; and minds are forced to think, which else might have been idle. Into the same quarrel was drawn the Irishman JOHN ERIUGENA, a Greek scholar and a Neoplatonist born too late; a mystic (he translated the Pseudo-Dionysius), and a volatilizer of Scripture and all dogma into allegory, not unlike Philo; and yet, an anticipated Abaelard, who placed logic above authority and worshipped the syllogism. Yet this dreamer-dialectician was the most truly original genius of his time.

The interests too of intellectual advance, not only the elucidation of dogma, were served by the work done by a PASCHASIUS RADBERT, Abbot of Corbie (d. c. 860), he too no mere transmitter of tradition. He codified what he had received; and, while fully sharing the symbolical, allegoristic tastes of his age, bore so strongly on the *realist* doctrine of Christ's Eucharistic presence,

that he both witnesses to the immutability of dogma and prepares the way for the formulae of later centuries.

Agobard, too, Archbishop of Lyons (d. 840), could turn a brain of true power on to problems more nearly practical; superstitions like relic- or image-worship, or misinterpretation of natural phenomena like hail! From monastery to monastery journeyed monks, carrying the books and doctrines of these men; and a strong ferment of thought is always to be discerned in the opaque materialism which made up so much of the Carolingian world.

In Italy, of course, where the Latin culture was hereditary, this was to be expected; culture had been depressed, but not destroyed. The civilization here was urban; "lay-schools for laymen" were numerous; literature, like local traditions, was still classicized. Troy and Carthage, Mars and Venus, the Muses, Cicero and Vergil were willingly alluded to. Not for nothing was Monte Cassino, wrecked by the Saracens in 884, rebuilt and adorned in the early eleventh century; it reached its zenith under Desiderius (1058–1087).

Already there were humanists in Italy, among those very monks who rebuked all traffic with pagan legacies. The brilliant professor, Peter Damian, railed at the classics in a Latin which, but for them, he never could have formed.

But sheer thought, even Italian-born, throve best across the Alps.

St. Anselm of Aosta left Italy for Bec in Normandy; there he followed Lanfranc as Abbot, and again, in 1093, as Archbishop of Canterbury in England; and, for all his gentleness and radiant sweetness of disposition and even look, withstood a king, William Rufus, without fear. In him, an exquisite and intuitional spirituality is mated with a keen intelligence. His philosophy is shot with meditation; almost, with ecstasy. It is his *delight* to *reason* upon his *faith*. His personal, joyous appreciation of his creed marks an emotional advance upon the laborious compilation, and even on the acumen of his predecessors; yet, even as it is less richly human than an Augustine's, it is less tenderly so, less pathetically, than will be a Bernard's and the completed spirit of the Middle Age.

We can but allude to the work of such an one as GERBERT of Aquitaine, monk at Aurillac in Auvergne, tutor of an Emperor (Otto II), Abbot of Bobbio (983), Archbishop of Ravenna, and Pope as Sylvester II (999). A philosopher-scholar in the Chair of Peter ! Let us say that this vigorous man, who collected and retained, perhaps, all the available knowledge of his time, was most influential in inspiring noted schools of future thought, and equipping them more generally and solidly with a preliminary method of dealing with the *stuff* with which thought itself must cope. Thus it was Gerbert's pupil, Fulbert, who (from c. 1000 to 1028) taught in and made famous, that school of Chartres which anticipated Paris.

Even the heresies of this time have their significance. It was from Chartres that Berengar of Tours appeared, an assertive controversialist ; and Roscellin, whose heterodoxies belong to the history of the Eucharist. But all this busy speculation, with its prides and petulancies, was making straight for the astonishing effervescence of thought which marked the XIIIth century, and was preparing the revolts which attend

originality. There is here no hint of intellectual death save in so far as life itself, if undisciplined, presages disruption. Are we wise after the event, in seeing, in the laborious taking over and "translation," by the Germans, of this alien Latin culture, the psychological background of their destined defections, which were temperamental no less than national? At least in such "taking over" they were diligent and at times audacious, as in the case of those learned nuns, like Hrotswitha of Gandersheim (c. 970) who wrote rhymed hexameters, lives of Saints, "deeds" of Emperors, and six moral dramas in imitation of, and as antidote to, Terence! Bruno (brother of Otto I) of Cologne; Bernward, bishop and adorner of Hildesheim; the historian Lambert of Hersfeld; the wholly lovable Hermann "the Cripple" of Reichenau; the philosopher too, Othloh of Ratisbon (c. 1000–1075), who faced the great problem of an All-mighty and All-merciful God confronted by the unhappy world and man's temptation-tortured soul—these are names which witness to the spiritual, intellectual and moral life of Germany. This is the hour of the true birth of nations;

Europe is no more speaking merely Latin ; temperaments are being revealed. But the primary source, and discipline, of these ideas and emotions, is that ancient Latin culture, which, having been caught up into Christianity, refused to die, at the very moment when the Eastern and the Greek, severed somehow from that vital principle of unity, displayed only a sterility which meant decay.

Such then is the terrain in which European thought planted its roots and spread ; no barren soil, nor devoid—strange paradox—of much fruit, though sparing enough of flowers.

§ ii

The Triumph of Christendom (1073–1303)

If a period be sought to which the name "Renaissance" can with full truth be applied, it must be that XIIIth century which has already worthily been called the Century of Origins. In other words, much that had seemed slain or withered blossomed out anew ; and yet—just as however much of its parents may survive in the child, so that they in it appear re-born, yet

is the child an independent life and stands at the head of its posterity—so uniquely fertile, liberative, and creative is the period spoken of in this chapter, that it appears far better than any renewal—*imitation* it never was—of the old, and a true fountain of the new.

Here we are concerned with its intellectual activity only.

Of that activity it can be said that it equalled and perhaps surpassed anything in history, even the greatest days of Athens. Hitherto, that is, since Charlemagne, the intellectual life had thriven in monasteries, abbey or Cathedral schools, and royal courts. Now it is to the Universities that the world begins to flock—Paris, Bologna, Oxford. France saw the rise and development of Angers, Toulouse, Cahors: Spain, now and later, of Valencia, Salamanca, Lerida, and Valladolid; Portugal, of Coimbra.

In Italy universities were numerous; even faction-racked Rome had hers. Though certain universities were pre-eminent for some special faculty, as Paris was for philosophy and theology, Montpelier (better than mere successor to Salerno) for medi-

cine, Orleans, for civil law, yet the teaching in all was truly "universal"; and all could find in each whatever they needed. Preparatory schools grew up under the shadow of Abbey or Cathedral; scholarships and burses were multiplied; students flocked in incredible numbers from distant parts as well as near—perhaps twenty thousand were at Paris, fifteen thousand at Bologna, ten thousand at Oxford; and even if these much reduced estimates exceed the fact, it can safely be said that the population of the Universities, in relation to the *national* populations (England then had some two or three millions only), far exceeded anything it has been ever since. Research and experimental work went on side by side with speculation; the conclusions of a philosopher like Albertus Magnus in, say, chemistry, astronomy, the physiology of plants and the physics of light and heat have astonished a Humboldt, and the results, in medicine and surgery, of a Guglielmo Salicetti of Piacenza, anticipated "discoveries" since deemed modern; and it is Roger Bacon, not Francis, who should truly be called "Father of Inductive Science."

And on all alike, Pope after Pope continually showered his richest privileges and encouragement.

In the world of politics and society at large, the problem proper to this age is the relation of Emperor to Pope; of Church, in a word, to State. Somewhat similarly, the intellectual world was racked by the mystery of the character and value of thought, and of its relation to Faith.

Bec in Normandy was a school whose founder's disciple, Lanfranc, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote against the rationalizing influence of Berengar of Tours. Anselm had followed, that soul incomparably sweet yet strong, who, in his zeal to reach true *understanding* from the starting-point of *faith*, practically began the scholastic method. This was carried forward, with less and less submissiveness (guessed or unguessed) to authority, by a Roscellinus and a William of Champeaux, and above all, by his disciple, ABAELARD. The hectic history of this "Alcibiades who reasoned like Plato, and philosopher who was more than half a troubadour" cannot here be related. Yet was his work still rather a new *method* than new thought:

nor did he " recapture " Aristotle (of whom he knew little save the simpler logical treatises) ; nor did he engineer any mighty reconstruction of ideas which should appropriately organize and convey Christian dogma. St. Bernard, who with the Premonstratentian St. Norbert, conquered him, did so rather by the force of a colossal personality than by creative intellect.

For hitherto Catholic thought had been continuous. As such, it had for end, Salvation ; its material, first and foremost, Scripture, dogmatic tradition and patristic opinion ; then, the whole field of available fact and theory, co-ordinate. Its method had been Augustinian, that is, more or less Platonic ; yet even here the balance had tilted, now this side and now that, with the relative weights allowed to reason and to authority. With Abaelard, reasoning has definitely won. In his *Theologia* he practically claims adequately to elucidate and substantiate Christian mysteries by reasoning. Yet his claim is not quite honest, even when he declares he is but shepherding the unshepherded, and " recommending " Christian belief to those whose intellect revolts against it. His mind

must be judged at least in part by his temper. Now his *Sic et Non* is a book in which he sets side by side patristic and other opinions, apparently, and perhaps really, contradictory, and in an almost impish spirit of mischief offers his disciples problems which he knows they will never solve, and himself indicates no solution. His method was merely destructive of "authority"; his mood was cynical; his criticism sterile: this, quite as much as his tendency to exalt "reason" to complete sufficiency, is what issues in his downfall.

Yet from this very book proceeded a consequence, which, had he hoped for it, might almost have justified its compilation. It gave rise to those "Books of Sentences" (Opinions) of which PETER LOMBARD'S was the most famous. Herein Abaelard's indiscriminating and chaotic collection of material is arranged, in a due series of problems, and reconciliations of opposites are attempted. This finally produced the famous *Summas* of an Alexander of Hales and an Albertus Magnus, and a Thomas Aquinas, in which the entire mass of knowledge, human and revealed, was re-

viewed, organized, and firmly yet exquisitely upreared from foundation to pinnacle.

It is surely an amazing thing to realize that these thirteenth-century brains were wrestling with problems which from earliest to latest have tormented intellects recognized by all the world as supreme in its history. For at the back of all this effervescence of thought lay the problem of thought itself and the nature and value of our "universal" notions. Even so, no doubt, philosophy was still intimately wedded to theology. Long ago, Roscellinus, when he faced the problem of "Universals" was so preoccupied with the *individual*, that, unable to assign any value to the notion "man," as opposed to the perception of this man or of that, leapt straight into the domain of dogma, tripped over the doctrine of God's Unity in Trinity, and would, says Anselm, "have spoken of three gods had not usage forbidden it." Opposite him, an Odo of Tournai found the reality of universal concepts so compelling, that "man" being to him more vividly real than this man or that, he perceived at once how original sin was transmitted, or rather, how manhood, being one real mass, was

infected once and for all at its source. To the Augustinian, that is, Platonized, Middle Age, this bias was the more natural. Abaelard, resisting this tendency in William of Champeaux, seemed to be colder and shallower in his dialectic. A HUGH OF ST. VICTOR was nearer to the natural world, and yet, more touched by Plato and more radically Christian. Mystery was *dearer* to him than what reason might exhaust. Characteristically, his greatest work is *On the Sacraments*. In them, spirit and matter are conjoined; and while, in his treatment of things, Hugh can sink to very tortured allegory, he can rise, too, winged by piety, to a very pure contemplation. Enough to have mentioned this great contemporary of Abaelard, to show how a difference of moral temperament may issue into divergencies in method and result, and how the more Christian is the more inclusive. Yet, as we said, hardly are these men to be called Aristotelians or Platonists. If Abaelard was dubbed, after Aristotle, the "Peripatetic," that is because he used, or misused, Aristotle's *logic*, not his philosophy as a whole. That was still unknown. Thus, Aristotle seemed to lead to heresy,

and was nicknamed, par excellence, the Heretic, and in manifold wise condemned. A John of Salisbury (1115–1180), the greatest classical scholar of his time, could still keep free from Aristotle; and Alan of Lille (c. 1128–1202) believed himself well anti-Aristotelian.

Soon after Alan's death, the "Philosopher" was reborn for Europe, and baptized. Long ago, Mohammedan scholars had translated Aristotle, helped by Greek commentators, from Syrian versions into Arabic. After Avicenna (980–1036), their study declined in the East and revived in Mussulman Spain. Here Averroes led (1126–1198); and thus Latin translations filtered into Europe. But direct translations were sought, especially after the capture of Constantinople (1204). Robert Grosseteste, of Lincoln, Oxford and Paris, Chancellor of Oxford and founder of Greek studies there, and master of Roger Bacon, did pioneer work. Better, two Dominicans, under or with Aquinas, started from 1263 onwards upon the translation which Aquinas used for his commentaries, the whole under the auspices of Urban IV, who had followed his pre-

decessors in condemning the misuses to which the earlier work had been put at Paris by men who did not realize how slavish was the all-but divine worship accorded to the "Philosopher" by the Arabians.

Aristotle triumphed in the progressive work of these men, the Franciscan Alexander of Hales, and the Dominicans Albertus Magnus and Aquinas. It were idle to seek to apportion the intellectual credit of this generation between the orders of Franciscans and Dominicans. If at Oxford the Friars Minor outshone the Preachers, then paled before Aquinas, yet we may say that, together, the two Orders absorbed, developed and propagated all that was most rich and progressive in the XIIIth century. There were those among them who remained in closer touch than did others, no doubt, with the Augustinian past. Such was the lovable ST. BONAVENTURA, born 1221, the Tuscan peasant boy who became pupil of Alexander of Hales, contemporary professor with Aquinas, Minister-General of his Order at thirty-seven, and Cardinal the year before his early death in 1273. Perhaps his work is destined to become better known to our

generation, in love with *will*. Though he too "commented" on Peter Lombard's Sentences, and in his *Breviloquium* systematized Christianity as thoroughly as did any *Summa*, in his superb *Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum* the Saint outsoars the Doctor, and we feel that hardly otherwise would St. John have spoken, had his been the thought-language of this sweet yet awe-inspiring soul. It was the ambition of ALBERTUS MAGNUS (c. 1193–1280), a Suabian nobleman, much travelled, and a Dominican official as well as an encyclopaedic scholar, to render all Aristotle accessible to the Latin world. He achieved this by his enormous literary output and his lectures at Cologne and Paris, and without him St. Thomas might have come to nothing. Though the enormous mass of his material was naturally but half-assimilated, yet he is *free*, and can edit, expound and correct; he has been called the "Titan" who assembles the material; Aquinas is to be the god who orders it. But Albertus was more, perhaps, and better: he designed the engineering of the sum-total of Christian knowledge for the raising of the Christian shrine: the actual edifice was due, none the less,

to the suave yet transcendent genius of AQUINAS.

This mightiest of scholars was one who had well seen the world. Kinsman of an Emperor, of princely and noble Italian and Norman stock; acquainted with Naples, Cologne, Paris and London and in touch with the first intellects of each; disciple of Albert the Great, and far outstripping his own master, this "Dumb Ox," as the thought-burdened youth was nicknamed, has indeed filled the centuries with his voice. Born in 1227, he died, still young, in 1274.

His *understanding* of Aristotle was profound. He disentangles every live thread of thought; he leaves no material unconquered. He destroys nothing, but adds much. "Of imperial mind as of imperial blood," he synthetizes, in a gigantic vision, the most disparate elements; his results he states with unsurpassed lucidity. With his white light of thought goes a close knowledge of the human passions, also a most sober sense. Physical fact, history, abstract ideas, divine mystery, are none of them neglected. He never is wrong about *what can be done with* each separate kind of evidence accessible to him: subtly he

distinguishes the *nature of kinds of proof.* He does not fear to study the psychology of Christ Himself; he is able to attend, none the less, to the most concrete of human, social and moral problems. With it all he is a poet and a Saint; and this intellectual giant was naïve, pure and humble. At the very end, he is under no illusion, nor dreams that his work is exhaustive, adequate, or final; like Vergil, he half-disbelieves in, and is anxious not to perpetuate, his own masterpieces. Yet will his work be dear to minds as different as Loyola's, Philip Neri's and Teresa's; and to his shrine our own generation is wistfully returning.

Is there any sadder thing than to watch the quick degeneration of any great achievement? With Louis and Innocent on the French and Papal thrones, State and Church appeared in harmony and destined to realize the noble and true ideal of Christendom. Yet Christendom was supplanted, how soon, by some cynical "Balance of Power," in which Nationalism triumphed, and peoples, frightened and resentful of one another, achieved a precarious equipoise of antagonism, not a

fraternal unity in favour of a transcendent aim. Exquisite was the Franciscan dawn, a spiritual dawn as fair as the radiance which put light in the narrow Catacombs ; but how soon each melted into common day ! Almost at once, too, the great scholastic system suffered fatal mismanagement from the hands of lesser men, even when, like the most brilliant of them all, DUNS SCOTUS, these developed its resources, in the direction of sheer subtlety, to the utmost. Even Roger Bacon, whose merits we can scarcely exaggerate, corrupted the very roots of the great synthesis by his angering onslaughts on current theological study, much as he might still subordinate thereto all science. Scotus, however (1273-1308), though probably maligned, has been connected by some with those who will so utterly distinguish the spheres of theology and metaphysics, faith and science, that they will practically set up two standards of truth, and hold that what is intellectually false may be religiously true, and vice versa. Theology becomes for them, pure speculation, or else, just a training for the will, a practical affair, rather than a completion

and a perfecting of thought. One result of this was, not so much the true emancipation of thought, as its stultification; a scholastic argument seemed to become so purely aprioristic, erratic, artificial, and uncreative, that it has been said that our word "dunce" is derived from those "practical fools" who liked to listen, idly, to the subtle juggleries of the inferior imitators of a Scotus.

Indeed, medieval heresy is, on the whole, a comprehensive *anarchy*. It revolts alike against the laws of thought, and the rules which hold society together. Side by side with rationalism, and less secretly but more immediately destructive than it was, went the false mysticism. The Catharists definitely set up Church against Church, and derived directly from the Manichaeans and the Gnostics by way of Bulgaria and Macedonia. In the XIIth and XIIIth centuries they penetrated Italy, Germany and France, and from their prevalence there in the south, were called the Albigenses (Albi, in Provence). They too believed in the Manichaean opposition of God and matter: the flesh was bad in itself; by the "perfect," marriage and flesh meat must be rejected.

Jesus, again, was but a subordinate emanation from the divinity; His work was but "docetic," and phantasmal; external worship, sacraments and oaths were to be rejected. Extreme violence and a whole onslaught upon feudal society brought on them a regular political crusade, headed by Simon de Montfort; Bernard, and then Dominic and his sons, preached against them; Innocent III permitted their banishment and the confiscation of their goods; Gregory, about 1231, in the interests of justice and leniency, founded the "Inquisition" to examine their cases and to prevent extravagance of punishment.

The tendency, included in the Catharist scheme, but isolated as it were and incarnate in the Waldenses, or Poor Men of Lyons, aiming to reproduce "Apostolic" poverty and simplicity of life, creed, and worship, belongs less to an account of the intellectual life of the XIIIth and XIVth centuries, than to that of the spiritual. But it produced itself into a political and social theory which deserves notice here. For mystical anarchy led to the ruin of all discipline alike. Once you deny all duty save to *holiness*, subjectively assessed, you

are logical in running counter, as these men did, to a political and social system, in refusing to fight, or take an oath, or to obey any authority which shall not be holy according to your own standard. The Waldensian tendency prepared and survived the "Reformation."

The *Fraticelli* or the *Spirituals* continued their influence in Italy. It was John Wyckliff of Oxford who elaborated these theories more completely. He rested his entire notion of government on Predestination. And, in his argument, predestination undoubtedly involved the denial of free-will. Outside this area, however, of psychology, he based his practical behaviour too upon predestination. The Church was, in fact, composed exclusively of the predestined. This Pope or that, then, were he not predestined, was not true Pope. Moreover, predestination is recognized by a man's moods. The law of these moods is in the Scriptures, to be studied and interpreted freely and by each. All this was applied directly to the State. A Ruler, or Government, not obeying the law of Christ, individualistically defined, has no authority. Property, in short the whole

social framework, was directly attacked by this man and his forerunners, and through the Lollards and the Hussites, their influence prepared the terrain in which the Reform should flourish.

By a tragic and paradoxical but inevitable consequence, this denial of free-will involved a wanton immorality which ruined that very purification of behaviour for which the greater men among these mystics professed themselves so eager.

Chapter IV

REVOLUTION AND REFORMATION

THE Middle Ages pass into a period which in many ways has to be deplored. In the reversal of so many verdicts upon history, which to-day we witness, nothing is more remarkable than the transference, increasingly felt as due, of the name *Renaissance* from the XVth to the XIIIth century. The XIIIth was the true creative period; the XVth, imitative largely. And if the latter contained, as you may say, more wit (though that too is doubtful), what inspired the former was undoubtedly the *spirit*. And because the XVth is to be called pre-eminently "human," not only its intuitions do not pierce so high, nor its results so fully live, but its influences tend to exert their activity in a naturalistic area only, though there they may appear to create a completer harmony than is made by aspirations some of which struggle, at least, to transcend it. Yet soon

enough that harmony becomes not fusion only, but confusion, and it is far harder to disentangle, say, the thread of thought from that of art or politics than in the days when dictates of the intellect were clear and definite, and behaviour merely in accord or not in accord with them.

§ i

Humanism

Even in the XIIIth century the spell of ancient beauty was making itself felt. But that forceful period could control and assimilate the new revelation of that element in Latin culture. Christian vitality laid hold on what it found, and made it a true expression of itself. Hence a rehabilitation of Latin preceded that of Greek by at least a century and a half. But the new Latinization of culture turned, not slowly, into its de-Christianization. Men began to borrow from the ancients, not alone their canons of literary and artistic *form*, but the substance of their ideas. Ancient Rome appeared in so many obvious ways more strong, more splendid and inspiring than contemporary Rome, when, in mid XIVth

century, cattle fed at the very altars. Vergil had been Dante's guide even in the unseen world; and when Petrarch (1304–1347) wrote, it was already considered a disgrace to hold Christian philosophy higher than the pagan. Indeed, here the older tendency to regard human thought as self-sufficient joined hands with that which taught men to rest content with human beauty. The main philosophical current was that Stoicism which a Seneca had interpreted to the Roman world. However high its theoretical ambitions, its dictum *Follow Nature* was bound to be misapplied by men who felt in themselves the leaping instinct of individual liberty; and contempt of supernatural prohibitions issued as naturally into the emancipation of passion as it did of thought, and into *Nationalism* in opposition to the old idea of *Christendom.*

During the absence of the Popes in Avignon, "nationalism" displayed itself in Italy in the form of little tyrannies: the Visconti, the Sforza, especially the Medici at Florence began to surround themselves with courts which they tried to decorate with all brilliance. Here then were created centres

for a Philosophy, as for an art, which emancipated themselves from all save what should flatter their patrons. Great and real scholarship often was combined with a philosophy which held Christian tradition in frank contempt, and with a prurience scarcely surpassed in the worst days of the pagan Empire. The supreme disaster was that the Papal court itself never realized the corrupting tendency of the movement that it fostered. Doubtless a man like Vergerio was a good Christian humanist; but the presence, say, of a Poggio at the Vatican was a scandal, and when Nicholas V ascended the throne, humanism ascended it with him and a first period of its history closes. Crusades might absorb moneys hitherto paid to scholars and artists, and the ex-humanist Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini might, as Pius II, detect and resist the evil tendencies, and prosecute, even, a Pomponius Laetus, the "Pontifex Maximus" of the new-founded Roman Academy, the home of pagan ideals, of worse than pagan vice, and sheer anti-social conspiracy. But Sixtus IV relapsed; he made the scandalous Platina head of the Vatican library, and, after Alexander VI and Julius II, Leo X gave humanism its

apogee of triumph. Disaster followed quickly: within a decade of his death, Rome was sacked by the Constable of Bourbon in 1527, and the obvious outbreak of religious anarchy abroad opened at last the eyes of the Pontiffs and reform was seriously undertaken.

In other countries national characteristics were by now so strong that they could substantially modify a culture which after all was indigenous to Italy. The French classical revival expressed itself rather as contempt of scholastic and university tradition than of Christianity itself. Even in Germany, the earlier "renaissance" suggested no ultimate disaster. Though the ecclesiastical courts of Mainz and Worms might vie with the Italians in their worldliness, yet a Wimpheling and a Rudolf Agricola of Heidelberg (d. 1482)—an admirable classical scholar and master too of the national culture and a sincere Christian—could deplore the "pagan way of thinking and judging" now prevalent in Italy. Erasmus went far further than he thought or meant to, towards undermining all Catholic authority. He united that authority in one contempt with the Middle Age,

of which the degenerate close eclipsed the splendid creative period; and his determination to "preach Christ from the sources" sounded well in the ears of individualist interpreters of Scripture and accorded ill with his mocking, corrosive spirit. Afterwards he lamented his rashness, and sighed for the atmosphere he had breathed in the home of a Thomas More, who with men like Grocyn, Linacre and Colet stood at the head of the New Learning in England. At first, little but good seemed destined to come from it in this country.

This is not the place to criticize, condemn or justify the Church's attitude towards the new and confessedly pagan culture: we have had, once more, to show the soil in which the seeds of universal revolution were being sown, and to indicate the tendencies which any true Reformation—even in the interests of continuity of thought—would have to combat.

§ ii

The Religious Revolution

Humanism then had not only tended to paganize the will, but had cut at the *roots*

in conscience of the whole European order. The tree died, and was then cut down, and to the shrivelled wood Luther applied the torch of his temperament. Courts and lawyers had, hitherto, waged war against the Papal ideal; now they were able to ally to themselves a man who (they could not foresee) should ultimately destroy themselves. To this fierce popular individualist, any anti-imperial prince or politician, anti-traditionalist mystic or even scholar, crypto-heretic or crypto-anarchist could apply for that German eloquence which was needed to inflame the masses. First papal, then conciliar authority he rejects; patristic and historical tradition and practice; finally, Scripture itself, by his purely individualistic interpretation and indeed discrimination of its documents. Social revolution had anyhow, in Germany, been inevitable. Emperor, princes, nobles, peasants, liberated by the saving doctrine "Sin sturdily, but believe still more sturdily," plunged the country into a religious, political, social and moral chaos. Even Erasmus shrank from the havoc let loose; sect after sect, ever less like anything that could be called "Christ's Church," sprang daily up and were at once

at daggers drawn. Luther and his compeers acknowledged bitterly the frightful degeneration of their country folk since Papist times; and this tragic man died despairing of his work. Even so, he did not foresee how the unbridled individualism he fostered was to issue, in the long run, into whatever form of monism had power to maintain itself; political, and intellectual and moral absolutisms, that is, and the right of might; and the enclosure of man's thought within itself and consequent universal scepticism; and the effacement of all moral values. His turbid mind indeed foresaw nothing, and made no effort to deal with consequences.

The superior lucidity and logic of the French mind enabled a Calvin not only to codify reformed doctrine with a freezing and relentless accuracy, but to substitute for the old authority a tyranny even more arbitrary than the Pope's, since it was his own; and again, since Frenchmen are not mystics, a Henri IV felt no attraction in German illuminism, and, once he saw its anarchic consequences, saved France for the Church by his conversion in 1596.

In Sweden and Denmark, the Reform

was even less spiritual or intellectual; and in England it had its peculiar history too, outside the region, on the whole, of thought.

§ iii

The Catholic Reformation

At once it is clear that this upheaval was both a challenge and a check to originative thought. The old had to be defended, but in a new way.

The first area where thought was forced to energize, was the *Council of Trent*, of which the enormous influence has been much decried because its detailed reforms remained often inoperative. Really, it gave a gigantic stimulus to a slow and therefore sure regeneration of the atrophied or diseased tissues of the Church's organism. In the region of the intellect, it codified and formulated Catholic dogma as opposed to the innovators; but also, and better, profited by their errors to develope certain branches of theology as yet too little tended; suicidal idolatry of Scripture occasioned work like that of Maldonatus which, for his time, was masterly; the claim to restore "primi-

tive Christianity," a historical school to which Baronius, for all his shortcomings, still inevitable, was a certain guide; his work is continued by the Bollandists. The notion of Authority, underlying the treatises on Church and Pope, and the discussion of the relations between Church and State, developed by a Bellarmine and then SUAREZ, have never since then lacked elaboration; the special heresies concerning grace, free-will, and the like, gave birth to controversies which, by way of heterodoxies like those of Port Royal, du Bay, and Jansen, at least elucidated the complete content of Catholic dogma and the riches of true psychology, and are carried forward by those modern theologians whose due care is the full discussion of the Natural and the Supernatural, their notion and interaction. Nothing is more instructive than to find how utterly organic is the work of the Council of the Vatican with that of Trent.

Yet it may be said that a certain reaction, in part necessary and desirable, drew thinkers back, despite real progress, to a somewhat anxious rigour. It was all-important, in the eyes of Catholics, to

safeguard dogma. Hence theology came to appear departmental, divorced from the legitimate ideals and methods of the sciences, which were, correspondingly, secularized; especially Aristotelianism suffered, and philosophy again tended to become as independent as the positive sciences, to the grave danger of the world of thought in general. For not only was its own value impaired, but, by a natural reaction, those very investigations which claimed the right to proceed untrammelled by tradition, authority, or transcendental preoccupations of whatever kind, returned on their footsteps, and illogically, and therefore unscientifically, invaded the realm of philosophy, of general ideas and ultimate causes; and heterodox explanations of the origin and destiny of the world came to be given by men whose proper study was *fact*, and whose hypotheses, however legitimate as such, and fit for the furtherance of science, should not have been allowed to intrude upon the terrain of philosophy. Endless confusion of thought has resulted and has lasted ever since, from the dismemberment of the systematic outlook of the Middle Ages. Moreover the necessary withdrawal

of the Church's thinkers within their trenches, their inevitable stand on their defensive, did for a considerable while impoverish their work: they tended to hunt for arguments to buttress the established merely; and the peculiar material belonging to most Christian apologetics, the historical, that is, was not yet well in their possession. Hence we must regret, though we can well understand it, if their work (like that of their adversaries, of course, in the same department) was not first-rate. But, *except*, precisely, among first-rate men, this inclination to repeat, to risk no novelties, implied the perpetuation of the second-rate, until the struggle to say the same things rather differently led to an unsubstantial verbal decoration of outworn themes. Hence much theological or at least apologetic literature rather followed the course of art, which went through a period of relative austerity and nudity, previous to the worldly flamboyance of the closing XVIIth century.

Reform declared itself, however, constructively too, and in three directions chiefly, apart from the direct purification of the Papal Court and the bracing of the

ecclesiastical spirit generally. Christian philanthropy took on an astounding fervour and developement: with this we have not to deal. The mystical life, again, under the influence of St. Teresa and of St. John of the Cross, equalled or surpassed its best glories heretofore, and has remained strongly coloured by the Carmelite spirit, in all sorts of half-guessed ways, ever since. But neither of this need we speak. The interests of thought were best served by an amazing revival of education. St. Angela Merici was a creative force in the education of girls. To the Jesuits, founded by St. Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), was mainly due the "re-instruction" of Europe and the recapture of the renaissance. Sufficient to say that their success was so overwhelming that it aroused the violent antagonism of the Universities, and thus ultimately made a contributory cause of their downfall. They were, too, exposed to the peculiar danger of a system which is, after all, in some essential degree *imitative*. The training of the Society undoubtedly went to produce admirably efficient men of a generally high level of worth, rather than of isolated and very originative geniuses.

Such men are perhaps too likely to trade on their resources without really developing them; and doubtless, to some extent, that happened. However, the Jesuits provided the seed plot for a number of first-rate men, and in their special way renewed the work of the early Benedictines in a distracted world.

§ iv

The XVIIth Century

Hitherto the new explosion of Catholic life had been Spanish, on the whole, in origin. Religious wars had seemingly delayed its manifestation in France, the true home of ideas. But with a Vincent de Paul and a Francis de Sales, we see that our eyes, for the future, must be turned in that direction. Practical piety is here, however, more noticeable at first than thought; organization, rather than creation. Even when we see thought and reflection displaying themselves, they are vitally allied to the religious reform, and to a determined effort to restore what was felt to be pure worship on primitive and conservative or even archaistic lines.

Even the great practical no less than speculative doctrine of predestination began, in the wake of Calvin, but well under the aegis of Augustine, to resume primary importance. Du Bay of Louvain (1513-1589), amplified by Jansen, Bishop of Ypres (1585–1638), and utilized by the Oratorian Quesnel (1634–1719), taught a doctrine which attached more importance to the case of a humanity in many ways *incurably* sick, rather than to the optimistic ideal of such theologians as the Greek Fathers and the nobler scholastics, who dwelt on the substantial elevation of human nature to the divine. The distinction is enormous and radical in Christianity. Very great names are associated with this movement, from Pascal and the Port Royalists, to admirably orthodox historians like the Jesuit Petau, and orators like Bossuet to whom the customary scholasticism had become distasteful, and, of course, all the series of great theologians whose theme was the character and work of grace.

By a singular paradox, the partisans of archaic rigidity could find only the philosophy of Descartes with which to replace

or modify the scholastic ; while it is precisely within the orthodox school, which was already defending, and thus (it proved) preparing the rebirth of scholasticism, that a coherent system of the *development* of *doctrine* was destined to be born. On this side and on that, the tenets of Jansenism continued their echoes—in the lofty and somewhat speculative devotion of Oratorian authors, directed to the worship of the Incarnate Word ; in the various schools of casuists, for which the Jesuits, with their insistence on the *will* and the needs of the average man, were so largely responsible ; and in the opposite direction, again, among the Quietists, like Molinos, Madame Guyon, or even Fénelon, who, in different measures seemed to annul the will and preach an inert subjectivism.

It must not be forgotten, however, that in the early XVIIth century was taking place a revival of Catholic learning which set a model even to those who were destined to improve on its results. But this work—like Petau's, or that of the Benedictines of St. Maur, or of other biblical or hagiographical scholars like Papebroche, Richard Simon, Ruinart ; even among the laity,

like du Cange—is (as in that increasingly objective-minded century, was proper) one rather of research and criticism, and the providing of material for thought, than of thought itself.

In England, Catholic thought was barely to be expected. The Established Church and the universities themselves were stagnant and ever more degraded ; theology, such as it was, became either rigorist, or traditional, discreet, and protestant, and set towards deism. In Germany the world was perhaps a little less coarsened; but neither was there here much hope for Catholic liberty of reflection or expression.

Smaller men, yet not, in their miserable centuries, insignificant, resist everywhere alike the corrupt influences which, under the mask of "Philosophisme" in France and of the *Aufklärung* in Germany, were sapping the base of belief and of society together. The Absolutisms of the period had become so ridiculous as to cease, almost, to be harmful, since their downfall was so imminent and inevitable.

Before anything else of great could be expected, the world needed a sharp lesson-

ing, and, in the Revolution of 1789, got what it needed. A new era commenced for the Catholic Church, as for Europe.

Chapter V

THE MODERN ERA

ODERN times really began with Kant in Germany and the Revolution of 1789 in France. Of this man and this event, the man on the whole is the more important. Society recrystallized (owing to the quickly-felt human—and especially French—instinct for law, and to the pressure of finance), though the new framework was not and is not likely to be permanent; but the mental world has remained anarchic.

But indeed neither Europe nor any one nation had for a century and more possessed any true mental or spiritual unity, not even Spain. Hence, in fact, the extraordinary difficulty of giving any intelligible picture of the thought proper to the subsequent generations. As it is, we shall isolate only a few of its tendencies.

§ i

In the last chapter certain results of the

spiritual revolution of the XVIth century were indicated. These may now be recapitulated, viewed not as results, but as general states of mind which, by partial fusion and partial antagonism, created or conditioned what happened later. We shall have to indicate tendencies only, existing simultaneously for the most part, but in each country coloured strongly by national temperament even when reducible to a quite general formula, or patient of a label such as "pietism," "rationalism," and the like. It is probable that such a state of things will permit the rise of men of distinction, in various departments, more numerous than the average, but will be unfavourable to the birth of really synthetic, yet creative personalities of a commanding type. A Kant will be made possible, but not an Aquinas.

The first true product of the religious revolution apart from mere superficial phenomena, is the rationalist tendency. Curiously, it began in England rather than in France, so much more *logical*. The occasion for this was, that educated men perceived that the Reformed Religion was attempting to subject the mind to a coercion no less

tyrannical, because it was bibliolatrous, than they conceived the papal to have been. The real reason was that the rejection, in the person of the Pope and of the teaching Church and of tradition, involved the complete individualism of the critical intellect; and all authority alike, save freely chosen political frameworks of practical utility, went by the board. Lord Herbert of Cherbury (d. 1648) substituted deism for revealed Christianity, and a natural religion for a supernatural. The movement looked much further than it knew: partly, it forced its own antagonists to act upon its principles, and Christian apologetics themselves became rationalistic (Toland, Tyndal). But also it connected with men like Herbert and Bolingbroke much greater names, like those of Hobbes, Locke and Hume (d. 1679, 1704, 1776), who, though not primarily religious, or anti-religious philosophers, yet in varying measures very directly affected the notion of revealed religion, and formed a truer link with the Continent. Hobbes's political theory subjected the Church, as a part of social machinery, entirely to the monarch; Locke, professedly not averse to Christian belief, undermined it by his sensist

philosophy; Hume saw that his special method issued at once into at any rate religious scepticism. England characteristically considered itself shocked. Not so France, where Bayle (d. 1706) started a movement which that logical and fearless nation carried through. The *Encyclopédie*, edited by Diderot and d'Alembert, 1751–1780, popularized this; Voltaire gave it great glory (d. 1777), owing to his personal wit to which an especially piercing point was given by his once more personal hatred for Christianity, a hatred that even his satirical predecessor Montesquieu did not at first dare to show. Materialism worked itself out fully in, and was more coarsely proclaimed by men like Holbach (1723–1789) than would have been possible in respectable England or even (on the whole) in ever half-idealistic Germany. Rousseau (d. 1778) indeed suffused his materialism with that sentimentality which is so peculiarly disgusting when it infects a Latin mind; but his work only rotted what others battered; and when it is remembered that in France Christianity and Catholicism were identified, and that the machinery of the Church functioned in

closest connection with a corrupt court and a tottering monarchy, it will be seen what strong social allies the philosophy of these writers had at hand.

In Germany the movement very soon came to be more profound than mere anti-religious and fanatical rationalism. However, in the first half of the XVIIIth century, that is certainly what it was. Paradoxically, it was a German, Matthias Knutzen of Holstein, who attacked Christianity by attacking the Scriptures ; and a Reimarus could critically assault the Resurrection. And by a continued paradox this became almost normal; it was the court of Frederick II of Prussia (1740–1786) which collected brilliant men who were turning upside-down the whole of the old notions of State and Church alike. The *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* (1765) is closely affiliated to the *Encyclopédie*; while two facts, due presumably to national temperament, are to be noted. The *Aufklärung* gained a halo from its poets ; and its notions were preached from pulpits. The effects of this were incalculable. It became felt to be a German glory ; and also, it could work secretly : Lutheranism

was rationalized from inside, and the people did not know what was happening. This was corrosive, and more deadly than the vulgar attacks which no one could be in doubt about. Gallic wit, undisguised, did less damage, perhaps, than Teuton poetry. For *feeling* is part of human nature, and aspiration. Now rationalism as such was merely destructive and had no room for feeling. When then Lessing, Goethe, Schiller were strongly romanticist as well as—relatively to the old order of things—quite rationalist, they catered for a much more general public, answered to much more within the spiritual complex of each, and yet carried on a real work of contemporary destruction. Even a Herder, who believed himself hostile to all rationalism, and indeed became passionately Christian in his own sense, really taught that the human spirit is the beginning and the end, the product of and in the long run identical with that nature which it devoutly must call God. The two parts of *Faust* may stand as symbol for the path pursued by these men : rationalism had been accepted; but it emptied the world and turned it grey. Romanticism had to give back blood and

spirit to life: the spontaneity of nature, its rich fertility, had to be the aspect of the world which man best should contemplate, not its mechanical necessity. *This* was true: but *that* was best worth contemplating. Even so, the life remained *naturalistic*.

But at this point the surviving elements of the rationalist movement may be said to have mated with those of the Pietist movement.

The mental and even moral anarchy consequent upon the individualism of the Reform had, for a while, still to be called religious. The polygamy, say, of the Anabaptist sect (1525) was involved in a religious scheme. But it was clear that the rejection of Authority and the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, broke down too many dykes; and the Christian life was spilling itself out and being lost in earth, and making merely a morass. A counter-reformation within the Reform had to be made. Complex causes gave rise to the Puritans in England; but the Pietist movement in Holland and Switzerland began (about 1660) simply for the sake of restoring some Christian feeling to

the Reformed Churches. Spener tried to re-Christianize Lutheran Germany by founding *collegia pietatis* (Frankfurt, 1670) which should coalesce into an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, and Count Zinzendorf's creation of the Herrnhuters (1727) had consequences in social layers which somewhat similar English movements did not reach. Such was the Quaker movement (1649), and the Methodist revival which began within the Church of England (John Wesley, 1703–1791) though it was thrust out from it, and left but an echo there in the Evangelical movement which, in so far as it has survived, has proved the soundest element in Anglican developement. Swedenborg (his chief book, *True Christian Religion*, appeared in 1770) may here be mentioned. All these and similar movements began with enthusiasm which tended to become visionary; and despite much that was spiritually sincere and even attractive, they tended to agglomerate into local fanaticisms; while the austerity of behaviour—itself too, at first, very honourable and attractive—which alone kept these gaseous masses of emotion in some sort of shape, set hard into a dismal conventionalism, stupidly

and at times cruelly intolerant. None the less, a bias of mind was created which continued to play its part till the last generation, in the northern countries at least, and still does in submerged or isolated places. However, what is quite fluid or quite rigid has little chance of surviving in modern conditions; and though the dialect and even the gusts of "pietistic" emotion still show themselves from time to time, yet the movement has not, in England or America, produced anyone who can really be called a *thinker* of wide and permanent importance, and the German name which will best survive, is that of Schleiermacher, a lovable man with a psychological history of very great interest.

It remains that by 1800 the spiritual destitution of this country at any rate, and you may say of all "progressive" Europe, was quite appalling.

There are two more tendencies which must be touched on, though it was later that they isolated themselves and can best be observed.

Science was advancing with extraordinary rapidity. But perhaps with the Encyclopaedists alone was it frankly

irreligious. Even Voltaire, in so far as he envisaged scientific discovery, did not feel it conflict with his deism. Nor did Locke. Spinoza was frankly pantheist, you may say mystical. Descartes and Leibnitz remained "spiritualist" or theist. But discoveries like those of Copernicus, Kepler, Newton so violently shifted men's *cosmic perspective* that the possibility of harmonizing the new facts with theology seemed for the most part desperate. The religion of the scientist seemed destined from the outset to be structurally alien to that of any existing Church. Orthodoxy seemed, in any case, to be doomed. In history, the consequences of the new spirit, and of freedom to construct the evidence as you pleased, were not at first so apparent. A great deal was still taken for granted.

What was afterwards to become all that is known, roughly, as "Socialism," was again preparing, in the pitiable condition, of course, of the labouring classes—but of the purely social aspect of this problem we are not here speaking—and also in the liberation of general though very unscientific ideas. The individualism of the

Reform and of the period immediately preceding it, when medieval notions and practices were in decay, prepared, remotely, the social revolutions ; also the concentration of properties and immense fortunes in the hands of a few. Though this began chiefly through royal favouritism, and in England, through the attack on the Church and monasteries, it was continued, with a mere re-shuffling of the social status of the capitalists, when machinery was being invented and commerce and industry assumed their modern guise. For the workers there was no improvement as long as the *system* lasted, though philanthropy began to alleviate their lot in definite points. This, however, could not keep pace with the rise of cities and factory life. Thinkers however had not really begun to give body to the vague emotions and Utopian ideals liberated or stimulated by, say, Rousseau, whose idyllic picture of the "equality of man" was unsettling enough, for all its fatuity from the point of view of scientific history. It remains that in so far as all this tended to destroy the established or at least traditional framework of society, it militated also against such

religious systems as were still bound up with this ; besides, materialist and rationalist views were by now filtering down to the masses, and men too dulled hitherto to think or even feel, were being roused emotionally and asked to cope with the unaccustomed impact of ideas.

When in 1789 the revolutionary cyclone broke out in France and swept over the whole of continental Europe, England was, in one sense, left aside : but anyhow the need of withstanding the Napoleonic menace was enough to occupy her for the while : her time was in part not come, and in part, perhaps, artificially delayed. However, the fall of the French monarchy, the abolition of feudalism, the wholesale confiscations of property and gold, were teaching the masses that you could take what you wanted, that there was plenty of it, and that to get it was none too hard. The most inviolable, the most sacred even, went first. It would be idle to catalogue the suppressions of monasteries, abbacies, sees, revenues, in France, Spain, Austria-Hungary, Italy and Germany. Besides this, in France the mob had felt its power and tasted blood ; with the Monarchy, Chris-

tianity itself had for a while been abolished, and an actress enthroned on the altar of Notre Dame. But anarchy cannot last. Firm-knit theories began to replace the visions and the nightmare, and to control action. Until Proudhon, however (1809–1865), who was the true founder of the *school* of Anarchy, the French "Socialist" writers were still somewhat vague and Utopian (Saint-Simon: Louis Blanc: with them put Robert Owen, in England). The "scientific" period of this developement dates from the revolution of 1848: its principles were worked out in Germany; Lasalle was its prophet, but Karl Marx (1818–1883) its real creator. His book *Das Kapital* was published in 1867, and was based, of course, on a purely materialist conception of society. His foundation of the International Association of Workingmen in 1864, in London, was the beginning of a period of organization which still continues. It would be out of place here to describe its developement in any detail.

Churchmen, it is true, had by force of circumstances been found grouped, on the whole, with the rest of established per-

sonages. The Church's doctrine, however, in itself wholly just and therefore in the only true sense democratic, was capable of emancipation from these memories and of adequate statement and application to these new problems. Lamennais and his group, in France, first tried to do this: but his organ, *L'Avenir*, violent and restive, was suppressed: more was hoped from *L'Ere Nouvelle* which followed it: the names of Lacordaire and Ozanam are here to be mentioned and win universal honour. However the contemporary Socialism manifested such anti-Christian principles that any alliance with it became impossible; and Socialism, thus understood, was condemned by Rome in 1849. The Catholic movement could not however be checked; and while the more conservative preferred to put their hope in Christian charity for the healing of the nations, the view gained ground that principles intended to issue into just reforms should be thought out. Bishop Ketteler of Mayence is at the head of the movement properly inaugurated in Germany. Cardinal Mermillod, the Comte de Mun, Abbé Pottier (Belgium), Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Gibbons became in turn

famous. But what held the whole movement together was the superb series of Encyclicals issued by Leo XIII, which really covered the whole ground under dispute, and give ground for hopes that the Catholic social principles will be those which shall reconstruct a society so mortally sick ; so eager for cure ; so wholly at a loss for trustworthy physicians. In any case this entire aspect of European civilization has become strongly marked since 1789, and is now becoming predominant in England itself, in particular since the War has shown into what outrageous consequences the old system of Government and above all Finance issued and is still for the moment issuing. Thus a man may be forgiven if he forgets that there are other currents moving through the nations deeper still, though more hidden, and quite as sure though slower in their outcome. In fact, much that is called "labour unrest" *is* their outcome, even when it ignores this itself.

For Catholicism in particular, the theology of the Papacy could not but have, during this period, a special interest. Before and after the revolution, the Pope found

himself confronted by absolutist Governments. Napoleon was not much of an improvement on the Monarchy, nor were the tyrannical States imagined by some schools of socialism any better. Liberty of conscience always seemed to exclude the right to offer that obedience to the Holy See which the Catholic religion imposed. However, Napoleon by trying to coerce Pius VII unthinkingly showed how real was the papal supremacy, both in faith and discipline, over the universal Church; and this kind of political acknowledgement was reinforced by the sympathy evoked owing to the indignities which the Pontiff suffered at the Emperor's hands. Joseph de Maistre, especially through his book *du Pape*, de Bonald, and the group which formed itself around Lamennais in the earlier part of his career, restored a halo to the Papacy better than anything it had lost; and, after much conflict, this at least was gained, that in each country the issue was made perfectly clear, and the definition of Papal Infallibility in 1870 put an end, one may suppose for ever, to any substantial misapprehension among Catholics concerning the Pope's position. They can be

loyal and disloyal to it, but scarcely misconceive it. None the less, a new theory concerning the origin of the Papal position was supplied by the Modernist movement, on which we touch below; but it had a short life only.

Four real international forces, therefore, are found to survive from all this, and it may well be that the conflicts and alliances of the future rest between them. They are the Papacy, Labour, Freemasonry, and Jewish finance. Of these the last two are, one would say in essence, hostile to the other two. Hope then may be found in the reciprocal goodwill of a general true democracy and the perfect spiritual monarchy.

§ ii

The ideas which, by fermenting in the minds of the suppressed classes issued in the social Revolution came therefore in the main from France. An invisible, mental Revolution simultaneously took place in Germany which affected thinkers everywhere with extraordinary rapidity. Simplification is necessary here above

all; and I make no excuse for offering the barest indications only of what happened.

Briefly, most philosophy, so far, in modern Europe, that is, had concerned itself with *what* a man knows; it now preoccupied itself with *how* he knows anything; though the answer to this, gravely affected the earlier problem of "what." It is true that Locke and Hume at any rate had entered already upon this field. But Kant (1724–1854) in his turn, made himself master of this period. One may say that Kant diagnosed in man *two reasons*, corresponding to which were two worlds. The former issued in knowledge of positive fact and created the sciences (mental too); the latter dealt with what could have a duty-aspect, and here morals and worship found their place. But by means of neither could one know the *thing-in-itself*, that about which I think. In fact, I really only know that I think so and so; and that there are laws of my mind which *make* me think so and so. I assume that "something" exists owing to which my mind forms the idea, which I know, according to inevitable mental laws; but

of the thing itself I have no real knowledge nor can I speak about its intrinsic truth. Still less can I find any proof of what transcendent notions such as "God," "freedom," "immortality," really are. But I am imperatively urged, by a kind of consciousness of which I cannot doubt, to enact the (as it were) existence of these transcendental objects as against myself, and reach religion by contemplating all these felt "duties" as divine commands. Therefore I cannot *prove* anything about the contents of what is meant by "religion," nor indeed about anything at all: I can observe the way my mind works, and *its* contents, and "believe" accordingly; and codify my consciousness of duty-feelings, and act accordingly. Fichte went further. I cannot know the world of "things in themselves." Why demand, then, that there should be one? The thinking *I* creates those thoughts which alone I know; why, then, assume that there is anything beyond that? I *think* my "world" into being. Nor is this atheism. It is God who thinks Himself in me. The moral law alone is His direct self-expression within me; *I* think the world around me

to supply myself with material for applying my moral sense. Schelling may be said to have shifted the perspective in favour of the Universe. The Universe is a process: God is its source and sustenance; it evolves itself towards consciousness and personality: *I* am at a certain point in its progress towards completeness. Hegel (1770–1831) joined with these men in believing that all was Spirit, evolving from the Unknowable to the Unknowable, but he displayed a greater interest in the *process* as such (and therefore in History and in particular in Christianity); within this he perceived that each point, so to say, at which the process arrived was really a reconciliation of opposite ideas; and in this way he construed everything in terms of ideas, each generating the idea of its opposite, conflicting with it, and then being reconciled with it and forming a new starting-point. It may therefore be said of these men that their view of existence was "evolutionary," "dynamic," and "monist": altogether "intellectualist," and yet agnostic as to the intrinsic truth of anything which their ideas represented. In this sense they are all (though Kant least truly) to be called

pantheist. It will be seen that this eliminates altogether the whole *kind* of philosophy and religious belief to which Europe had hitherto been accustomed.

It is difficult to tell how wide the effect of this thoroughly un-Latin philosophy might have been—though France, often since 1870, and strongly though intermittently before, has shown herself prepared to succumb to German ideas—had it not been reinforced and in its evolutionary element popularized, by biological theories. It is true that one "evolutionary" system appeared to be in direct conflict with the Germans. This was the Positivist theory of Comte (1798–1857), who held that what mind essentially can *not* know is mind: the "metaphysical" age was an intermediate period necessarily passed through by humanity after it had transcended the "theological" one. Philosophy was good for ousting religion, but would itself be ousted by the "positive" age of science. For him, what science could not explain was *unreal*:—the crown and indeed God of evolution was just Humanity itself. The singular quasi-Catholic ritual which Comte evolved and in which he dressed his theory discredited

the man himself, but he introduced the notion of evolution, as practically applicable to human society, to many who would not have assimilated it in the shape in which the German philosophers offered it.

But it was Darwin who supplied the form in which the evolutionary notion most congenially reached ordinary English minds. The *Origin of Species* appeared in 1859, and, so confused was the general *kind of thought* in which the nation had grown accustomed to indulge, that not only was the evolutionary hypothesis there incorporated regarded as an established fact of science, but it was accepted as adequate and complete; and finally it was felt to account not only for the developement of *species*, but for soul and life, and to falsify the very groundwork of revealed religion and to destroy the value of the Bible. *Creation*, particularly of man, appeared an unnecessary version of what has happened. No doubt men of science and even Darwin himself instantly started to modify the original system; but such undoubtedly was the impression left in popular imagination, which is a supremely important factor in any national consciousness. "In the struggle

for existence, we have all evolved out of apes." Creation, original sin, redemption, heaven and hell—that at least received a new and final shock for men who held these beliefs more from hereditary emotion and in forms of speech than through personal conviction. And even these, rationalism had been ruining; and now observed facts seemed to support the theory. Spencer, once felt to be very impressive, experienced the need to organize the vast masses of scientific results now before the public, and further accustomed the average thinking man to the notion of one huge evolutionary process, starting from and ending in the Unknowable and demonstrated by those very objective facts which the Germans tended to scorn. No difficulty then was felt in transporting the evolutionary theory into a wider domain, and to construe with its help the whole history of mankind "opera sine divom," that is, assuming that it had followed an upward course of self-developement in all areas of time and space alike—a double false assumption: that the hypothesis was a demonstrated truth; and, that it would apply ethically and spiritually as well as biologically. However, it here

met and co-operated with the critical historical school of which we must first show the main course, illustrating it in what affected religious thought only and not, say, by the work done by a Wolff on Homer, which was in essence similar.

§ iii

The first sensational appearance of the critical spirit as applied to the Scriptures and their representation of the rise of Christianity was Strauss's *Leben Jesu* (1835–1836). He displayed Christ's life as a myth evolved by the early Christian Church. He thought he was steering between rationalism and supernaturalism; but, embittered by opposition, he showed in his last work, *The Belief Old and New*, that he had lapsed wholly into materialism. He was not even a "critic." He started from notions, not evidence, and volatilized the whole, you may say, of Christ's personality and career; and having declared that the Church created Christ, failed even to suggest what had created the Church. F. C. Baur of Tübingen, who followed him, tried to found not unsimilar conclusions upon a critical study of the documents

of the New Testament. He pronounced nearly all of them spurious. He regarded them, Hegelian-wise, as produced by "tendencies" co-existing in the early Church, and often in conflict. It may be said that while parts of his method have survived, his conclusions have been falsified. Critics have leaned, even with no inclination to admit the supernatural in the old sense, to rehabilitate the Scriptures viewed as documents merely. Despite German efforts to popularize this sort of work (e.g. Strauss's *Life of Jesus for the German People*, 1864), it was Renan's *Vie de Jésus* (1863) which really achieved this. He betrayed Jesus, as has often been said, with a kiss; and the romantic charm with which he surrounded his representation of Christ rendered his book all the more destructive of traditional belief in the circles that read it. For the very boudoirs now could be religiously and gracefully anti-Christian. Renan was something of a biblical Rousseau. The Old Testament had already been subjected to a criticism based at first on principles mainly rationalist, without much search for evidence to back them; then the evolutionary notion was applied to the

religion of the Jews, and then historical research provided data which could be arranged according to evolutionary laws. There was here less opposition. The question found men less sensitive than did attacks on traditional beliefs about Jesus. Still, in the train of a movement properly begun by Vatke in 1835, men like Kuenen in Holland (1870) and Wellhausen (1883) and Robertson Smith in England (1881), to mention a very few names out of possible scores, accumulated an immense amount of material which has equally been at the disposal of Catholic scholars.

Naturally, this method of assuming the evolutionary law and of combining with it evidence amassed by research, was applied very soon to the history of Christianity as well as to its origin. The attempt to create a "history of dogma," in which department Weizsäcker (1886) and above all Harnack (1886–1888) have made themselves most famous, became normal. And along with this examination of Christianity in itself, is to be observed the endeavour to put it in its place in the *world's* religious history: the "history of religions," then the "comparative study of religions," form

a new branch of research and field for theory; all manner of origins are assigned to religion, and the scientific explanation of all religions as rising from one impulse and one custom is attempted: totemism (Reinach), animism (Tylor, Spencer), magic (Frazer), a score of other theories have been elaborated down to our own day; nearly all of them suffering from the unwarranted transportation, into the spiritual and moral spheres, of the theory of physical evolution, in accord with which the evidence has to be arranged; and that which has to be proved, is assumed. It would be a gigantic task even to outline the new "sciences" which have sprung up in connection with this huge enterprise; it would be quite impossible here to make them so vividly realized as to convey how massive has been this movement and how penetrating too. Its departmental schools rise and fall, and even the most fashionable, at a given moment, are quick enough discredited. But it will be very long before the *general way of looking at* the religious phenomenon is much affected by orthodox criticism of details. Only an enormous labour on the part of Catholics, and the

formation of a mass of evidence by which the traditional "hypothesis" can be equivalently supported, will render Catholic Apologetic adequate to cope with this class of adversary and the bias they have set. I do not forget for a moment that Catholics have done and are likely to do a great amount of work quite as good in quality as that of their opponents, and far more likely to survive precisely because they are not at the mercy of fashionable theories, and are, in that sense, as free as anybody and far more tenacious of what is valuable in the past. But we are not trying here to apportion merit and demerit, still less, to prophecy; but to indicate the main lines of a new and very influential factor in the religious world.

It goes without saying that even in Germany there were reactions. F. E. B. Schleiermacher (1768–1834) impressed himself upon most Lutheran theology after his time. He was a very earnest Christian, a firm believer in the historic Christ and even in the Church. But for him too that which constituted belief was totally independent of pure thought. All came back to *feeling*: a unique experience: experience

Christ, and forthwith you possess the "revelation of Christ" and of God in Him. The Church is humanity as held together by such consciousness of Christ. Redemption therefore operates really from within, for it is this consciousness which is purifying. Yet even he, in his philosophy, comes back to a sort of pantheism, and his religion is somehow little more than a warm sympathy for the universe viewed as God who expresses Himself most fully in Christ.

Ritschl (1822–1888) is the only other Christian name which makes some sort of a landmark. He was frankly pragmatical; a James anticipated. This burly, combative man regarded the truth of a thing to be what it was *worth* to us. Knowledge consists of value-judgements. His system was therefore a practical one. He begins from the consciousness of sin, and of a simultaneous will for betterment. You observe that contact, as it were, with Jesus cleanses and betters you. He is therefore *worth* that to you: He is therefore a Redeemer and Saviour.

Further, while the Romantic school, naturally strong in Germany, set men's sym-

pathies once more Romewards, by way of the middle-ages (Görres: Schlegel), the doctrine of Kant affected even Catholic thought. Hermes at Münster and Bonn (1775–1831) went very far along this line; and placed the certainty of faith in the practical reason and its mandate, not in the value of its evidences nor in the supernatural assistance of God. Günther of Vienna (1783–1863) again so rationalized the faith, on Kantian premisses, as to alter the meaning of the Church's dogmatic definitions, which he confessed to be the case, only, he taught, these definitions being *provisional*, their force might be maintained with a partly or entirely new content. It will be seen how far from modern Modernism is. These men, with Froschammer (1821–1883) of Munich, who conceived philosophy as wholly independent of, and yet able to supply adequate proof of, dogma, were necessarily condemned by Pius IX.

It was in the Conservative-Liberal arena that the German Catholic theologians best fraternized with the French whom we shall briefly touch upon below. The undoubted need of improving ecclesiastical learning drove men like Döllinger into the society

of those who like Montalembert were more nearly social politicians. The Congress of Munich, in 1863, presided over by Döllinger, and that of Mechlin, where Montalembert spoke in the same year, seemed to display a revival of Lamennais' liberalism; but since the quarrel was most accentuated in France, I leave it for the moment. This group of Germans was important within the narrow limits of its period, but has hardly left much mark, taken by itself, on Christian history.

And while most of these men believed themselves sincerely and in some cases passionately Christian, a current had flowed from Schopenhauer (d. 1860) through Nietzsche (d. 1900), gathering into a definite hatred for the principles and precepts of that faith. The monism of Schopenhauer started from the notion of will, the sense of which alone creates for each man that of reality and therefore of the universe; now since this perception is almost purely painful, the aim of life should be a true Nirvana, to be reached by negation of will as far as possible. In Nietzsche his own life of acute pain, and the intermittent insanity which became

permanent, helped him furiously to invert practically all received ethical ideals and to preach the doctrine of the superman which has won a sorry notoriety in our own time. But Nietzsche is really matter for a pathological study rather than a strictly philosophical; and indeed the whole psychology of the German race has been of late so denaturalized that since I do not wish, in this sketch, to allude to quite its most recent phenomena, hopeful or distressful, I will here only say that it has found, I think, its most suitable expression, exclusive of our own generation, in the music of Wagner's operas, *Tristan* and the *Ring*, and the Denkmal erected at Leipzig in honour of the defeat of Napoleon in 1814.

It would be possible to follow the line of Catholic "apologetic" in France also, and to indicate how there too a "romantic" school arose, successful in the person of Chateaubriand beyond the merits not of his theme—which was in reality the *beauty* of Catholic Christianity and its response to the wider needs of humanity—but (I think) of his real intellectual value. It rendered an immense service in that it turned men's

sympathies back towards what had grown to seem wholly unsympathetic even if true. But it found equivocal allies in those who so distrusted the human intellect, as misused by the Rationalists, as in fact to despair of it, and to deny its value for reaching truth at all. De Bonald (1754–1840) taught a pure Traditionalism: God imparted *en bloc* to primitive man a set of ideas expressed in suitable language which had been authoritatively handed down ever since. This was the only guarantee of sure knowledge. So too Lamennais (1818–1824) in his famous *Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion* relegated certainty to the assertion of some "collective decision" or judgement of mankind itself due to a primitive revelation; and Bautain (1796–1867) taught a form of *fideism* which sacrificed all intellectual knowledge to a trust in a primitive revelation coupled with an interior illumination given by God. Other doctrines approaching to these were taught, perhaps chiefly at Louvain, and all were in turn condemned by Rome. The same struggle to assign a basis for any knowledge, human or of faith, is visible in the Ontologist school, renewed, in the wake of Male-

branche (d. 1715), by Gioberti (1801–1852) in Italy and echoed by the Oratorian Gratry (d. 1872) in France: Rosmini (1797–1855), a man at once of keen political interests and of very great personal holiness, found his philosophy associated with that of the Ontologists. These in their turn were condemned, quite inevitably, inasmuch as at the roots of what they taught was the despair of the traditional philosophy of knowledge and the desire to reconcile the doctrines of the Church with the kind of mental philosophy in vogue since Kant.

It may in fact be said that this—in itself laudable—desire to utilize modern acquisitions without sacrificing the substance of what was traditional and guaranteed, was what created in all parts of the Catholic camp a division of spirits. Extraordinary animosities were thus excited, which in France expressed themselves, on the Conservative side, in the person of Veuillot, through his paper *L'Univers*, and on the Liberal side, in a much more dignified way, it must be confessed, in the *Correspondant*, with which are associated names of great honour, like Dupanloup and de Broglie. It was a period of great journalist activity,

which spoilt the spiritual value of much of these controversies; while even in the science at the disposal of the secondary personages on either side, if not of the protagonists, was a good deal of the flimsy quality noticeable in the art too of the Restoration and of the second Empire. In the English Catholic revival, then in full adolescence, a more serious quality was pervasively discernible, and there too, we may without false complacency agree, good taste and dignity were more general. The Conservative group, headed by Ward, with its organ, the *Dublin*, was not inferior to the Liberal, though he amply repaid the acrimonies of some of his opponents by exclusive insistence on his own extreme views. It may be repeated that the whole of this period reached its complete summing-up in the decisions—extraordinarily careful, balanced, and wise—of the Vatican Council, of which the organic connection with that of Trent is not the least interesting characteristic: and to it, and its consequences, attention should be directed rather than to the *Syllabus* and the *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX (1864) which, owing to the quite frantic controversies

they aroused, well beyond the Catholic world, would have to be examined across such a dense tangle of historical and personal imbroglios as to suffer, even now, almost inevitable misunderstanding. The Vatican Council, on the other hand, albeit never completed, is so massive in its outline, and so relatively simple in, so to say, its decoration, that despite the thunderstorms which raged about its up-building, its value in religious history can scarcely be mistaken.

I would wish to say no more about the phenomenon of Modernism than that it was, in our own time, the survival, or if you will, revival, of what we have just described, namely, the attempt to state Catholicism in terms of religious sentiment rather than intellectual, utilizing (in some of its departments) historical and scriptural theories of evolutionary and "critical" kinds.

The same over-great rapidity, and consequent flimsiness, which was noticeable in the constructions of the XIXth century, was often noticeable, too, here. Pius X, by his decree *Lamentabili* and the Encyclical *Pascendi* (1907), gave the movement as such its *coup de grâce* ; the tendencies which

expressed themselves on either side will presumably be eternal; of the practical consequences of this rebirth of old heresies it is difficult to judge, owing to the recentness of the events and again to the violent interposition of the War, which has severed most sequences of events. It may be supposed that as the Papacy emerged, not only, perhaps, a more recognizably spiritual power, from the cataclysms of 1870, but also more universally influential (I could support this seeming paradox), so from the appalling chaos of the present, of which paroxysms like that of Modernism were but premonitory symptoms, Catholic dogma is likely to arise at once clearer, stronger, and more impressive.

This may be indicated by a much simplified view of the evolution of both modern France and England. First, France.

Materialism, preached by Taine, sanctified by Renan, and popularized by realism in literature, backed by the enormous new fortunes, mainly Hebrew, of the Empire, found its full triumph among the politicians. A real degeneracy ensued. The crash of 1870 enflamed some generous ardours

which died down. A base version of internationalism discredited all general ideals of a nationally cohesive sort, such as patriotism and religion, and attacked all such institutions as preserved them, Army, Navy, Schools and Church. The ideal of pacifism, material prosperity and internationalism was substituted for these by a Government itself largely at the mercy of Freemasons and of Jews. The complete apathy of despair seemed to have settled down upon the younger generation, well reflected in its literature. From Gambetta to the *régime abject* of Combes a melancholy story developes itself. Still, in a country of the size and with the temperament of France, life is probably inextinguishable. Vital forces circulated, and expressed themselves in the appearance of a series of artist-moralists like Huysmann, poet-moralists like Coppée, above all, scientific moralists like Bourget, Taine's disciple; and already Brunetière, a supreme *littérateur*, had proclaimed the "bankruptcy" of the current science; and all these men, and others scarcely less notable, became Catholics. *Le Disciple* was a landmark. Well before the War, a new generation had sprung up. It

gained chief recognition, and indeed became fully self-conscious, from the March 31, 1905, when the Kaiser appeared off Tangier. His yacht, anchored off Agadir in 1911, clinched what Tangier had begun. The army became popular. *Le Soldat Bernard*, by Paul Acker (1908), may symbolize the revival of souls from the inertia consequent upon squandered passion, into an activity that looked towards not yet full Catholicism, but the concrete, the dogmatic, and the spiritually authoritative. Ernest Psichari, grandson of Renan, by his *L'Appel des Armes* (1912) and his *Voyage du Centurion*, 1916, definitely linked the revival of the military spirit with that of Faith. An extraordinary change came over literature. For not only did this rather disconcerting association of war with Christianity suggest a radical change of soul in large masses of the new generation, but "provincial" literature, and the cult of earth and home, were regenerated. There is a singular affiliation of a Maurice Barrès, in his *Colline Inspirée*, with Fustel de Coulanges, in his *Cité Antique*. The idea of continuity of civilization revives: and for France, that means the being *Gaul*, and

therefore Roman. With this went a revival of the Catholic social consciousness, amply equal to what was being done by the German Catholics, who have proved themselves, too, the victims to a marked degree of their false political system. The rupture of the Concordat simply gave new liberty to the Church's work, especially in great towns. French Catholic social effort has not been without its storms (the suppression, e.g., of the *Sillon*), but it has been intrinsically admirable, and without it the same phenomenon in England could probably not have appeared. As for the startling change which this new "will to live" introduced into the schools and universities, strongly specified no doubt by W. James's pragmatism which America has so characteristically supplied to our world, succeeding where its German predecessors failed upon the whole—it is best seen, not, perhaps in official and representative philosophers like Blondel and in part Laberthonnière, but from the evidence of a book like *Jeunes Gens d'Aujourd'hui*, by MM. Tarde and Massif, where the change towards, and often into, Catholic belief is startlingly set out. In Sorbonne the

evolution is indicated by the succession of these names of professors of philosophy: Lévy-Brühl and Durkheim (names significant apart from the fact that these men were frankly anti-Christian in belief!), Boutroux (all-but Catholic), and Delbos, a Catholic. Through the breaches in the materialist walls made by Bergson, many have advanced into a world of spirit, obedient to the full Catholic law of life, in thought and action.

Many an obstacle, built of popular prejudice, has then been cleared away by war. What the future contains, it is no part of this book's purpose to guess.

§ iv

In England, where there was no wide Catholic culture, the movement has of course been far more confused. On the whole, there has been one continued current, in the direction of unbelief, and one reaction in the direction of Catholicism.

After the Evangelical movement in the Church of England had run itself out, people looked to Oxford, and to the

Liberal movement as represented by Whately (afterwards Archbishop of Dublin) and T. Arnold (later, Headmaster of Rugby). Whately was really rationalist, though still anxious to maintain an independent institutional Church with formulas of belief. For Arnold the Church was only the State in its educational and religious aspect. With these has to be put Hampden, whose *Bampton Lectures* of 1832 were a stronger solvent of theology and even creed than anything for which average thinkers were prepared. His appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity in 1836 and afterwards as Bishop of Hereford in 1847 gave a great shock to the dogmatic element in Anglicanism. So did, we may here mention, the creation of the Jerusalem bishopric in 1841, with a bishop to be alternately Anglican and Lutheran; the Gorham judgement of 1850 and the episode of Colenso, Bishop of Natal, whose book (1862–3) on the Pentateuch created a greater commotion even than *Essays and Reviews* (1860).

It became increasingly clear how Erastian was the Anglican Church, at the mercy of the State, and careless of continuous dogmatic

teaching and impotent to enforce even what it believed it possessed. All this seems so distant and pale-blooded compared to what has happened since, that we need not dwell on what we can so little realize. For the movement called "Broad Church" pursued its way very rapidly; the poets, frankly revolutionary, like Shelley, Keats and Byron, and mildly naturalistic like Wordsworth, profoundly affected popular imagination and taste, and removed all sorts of barriers, the stronger because sentimental, from the road of solvent doctrines. Men like Erskine and Campbell, in Scotland, re-infused piety into an academic movement, but even their effort to preserve much failed in view of principles which dissolved more: Frederick Denison Maurice really popularized in England this Scotch theology, trying to persuade himself that the new principles, strongly allied to the Teutonic ones which we have outlined, would have no destructive effect upon the traditional system which he still loved. In different ways men like Stanley, Jowett, Carlyle, Emerson, Matthew Arnold, Martineau, and finally John and Edward Caird and T. H. Green, gave impetus to a

complete recasting of the old notions of religion, Christianity, and Church, which as a matter of fact had by now quite overflowed the borders of any institution, or indeed any definable borders at all. Add to this, Board-school education, and the persistence of a very crude and active rationalist campaign among the masses, resisted only by purely sentimental forces (though these too tend to crystallize into the philanthropical like the Salvationists), and you have the England of the present day exept for one element in its by-products to be described in a moment.

The "Tractarian" movement, dated by its founders in 1833, when, besides the first of the *Tracts for the Times*, a sermon by John Keble of Oriel, *National Apostacy*, created a sensation, began as a reaction against Whig ascendancy and Erastianism rather than as any revival of the old High Church school. What gave new life to dying notions of authority, continuity and "Apostolic succession," and traditional dogma, was the spectacle of the Continent and the history of certain heresies which, for these men, set the conditions and tendencies of the English Church in

sinister isolation. The leaders of the movement were the combative R. H. Froude; the gentle poet Keble (his *Christian Year* appeared in 1827); J. H. Newman, who at first had seemed to be deserting his hereditary evangelicism only to embrace Whately's liberalism; E. B. Pusey; W. G. Ward and a few others. Tract XC (1841) appeared to be purely Romanizing, and Newman himself became a Catholic in 1845. His *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* and *Grammar of Assent* are by far the most important products of the movement, in so far as they were concerned with nothing less than the whole nature and relation of Faith and knowledge, and with the character and the vitality of doctrine. The former book especially, owing nothing to Germany, and preceding Darwin's *Origin* by nearly ten years, seems from this point of view almost miraculous, and a true starting-point, though the Greek Fathers—not to say the Scriptures themselves—had centuries ago foreshadowed it. It was the modern and exceptionally independent application of a notion and method in truth traditional, though eclipsed; and for the true notion

of identity within "development" it is to this which we must look, not to the "evolutionists." Its existence is therefore of permanent and even prophetic value; far more so than the gradual reintroduction of Catholic ritual which afterwards supplied another nickname to those who were first called Tractarians and then Puseyites, or the various efforts to unite Anglicanism with Rome, like the Association for the Promotion of the Union of Christendom (1857); and when Leo XIII, despite his kindly letter *Ad Anglos* (1895), condemned Anglican Orders in 1896, the group which really appreciated this was not large. For it must be frankly said that the movement had by no means re-catholicized even the Established Church, still less England. True, the issues have been cleared, and yet again, confused. Catholic doctrines (except that of Authority) are a little better known in England: Catholic practices are, in a measure, more familiar. There has been a considerable levelling up of Church adornment and ritual. The Establishment is much more aware of itself as an active, philanthropic, missionary, and imperialistic institution. Latterly, much approved by

Edward VII, it has tended to develop a sort of state-and-episcopal ceremonial. It seeks to display itself at all moments of national pageantry; it extends timid hands to the Non-conformists and it smiles fitfully upon the Greeks. In part this is due to the nation's awakening from its nightmare of Georgian hideousness: aestheticism and the Victorian culture, assisted (in the background) by the romanticism of a Walter Scott, then, by Ruskin and the new architectural ideals he popularized, by the craft of William Morris and the art of the Pre-Raphaelites, and by the suave influence of Tennyson. It was much helped too by the imperialistic notion as developed by R. Kipling (we speak quite seriously) mating with the honest apostolic hopes of High and Low Church missions alike. And this spirit, once set stirring, displayed itself in the religious area as well as all the others.

But undoubtedly the Established Church is, as an institution, as much bound to the State, for the present, as ever; socially, it belongs to the upper classes by convention, though not by doctrinal or spiritual conviction; its bishops tend, despite a greater sense of responsibility, to be functionaries;

it has no teaching and little disciplinary power. Any doctrine, all-but Roman and quite agnostic, can be preached by its representatives with a minimum of friction: the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, miracles, the divinity of Christ in any intelligible sense—since His inerrancy of knowledge and even sinlessness can be denied with impunity—form no part of its imposed creed. It represents nothing national; and in fact we may safely say that not only the country is not Christian, but that it is not having Christianity preached to it.

* * * *

Such then is the environment in which Catholic thought has, since the religious revolution of the XVth and XVIth, and again, of the XIXth centuries, striven to do its proper work. It will be seen that never once has it been able to do this freely. On the one hand an unprecedented number of those who else might have devoted their lives to thought has been absorbed in the practical work imposed upon us by the last few generations. That has developed, and our realization of its urgency has increased, with an extreme rapidity. Again, the Church is very much im-

poverished; not only leisure is lacking, but the means to utilize it, even were it there, have largely perished. And, meanwhile, the proper apparatus for modern study has developed to a fantastic degree. To keep pace with the sheer literature of any one department means an often impossible expense. And again, students can rarely be, as once they could, universally efficient. So many new "sciences"—objective largely and needing research rather than speculation—have been created, and each demands experts.

Still, we have to acknowledge not only a steady maintenance, but even improvement and, you may say, a downright revival of ecclesiastical science. Of this the first symptom of importance is the rebirth of the study of St. Thomas. Leo XIII demanded that not by abandoning "scholasticism," nor yet by attempts to "reconcile" it with the new German thought, should advance be made; but the Scholastic Philosophy was to be studied in the spirit of St. Thomas himself, freely, that is, vitally, and therefore with due development. The University of Louvain was where Leo XIII, in pursuance of the

Aeterni Patris (which reimposed scholasticism upon the Schools, 1879), first willed a special Institute for this study should be inaugurated (1880–1). Its work has been of world-wide fame and importance. Scripture study, again, has revived, and with it that of history. Significantly, the best work has issued, perhaps, from those associated with the Jesuit University at Beirut and the Dominican school at Jerusalem. No one is ignorant of the modern school of the Bollandist tradition.

But since we have wished to indicate the environment of Catholic thought rather than enter into detail about that thought itself, and since in fact the number of excellent authorities has been indeed far higher, though epoch-making personalities have not revealed themselves as yet, save doubtless Newman, and since those who have attained general recognition are men of research or objective tendency rather than thinkers as such, we prefer to mention no more names, but to trust to this series to supply what this first volume has announced.

Printed in England for the Ambrosden Press by Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury.

72429 209.2R M366
Martindale, C.C.
Catholic thought and thinkers

209.2R 72429
M366